

THE QADIANI PROBLEM

S. ABUL A'LA MAUDUDI

ISLAMIC PUBLICATIONS (PVT.) LIMITED
13-E, Shahalam Market, Lahore. (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

Preface	(vii)
The Qadiani Problem	1
Queer Interpretation of Khatm-e-Nabuwwat	2
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's Claim to Prophethood	5
Consequences of claim for Prophethood	6
Religion of Qadianis is Opposed to Islam	7
Implications of New Religion	8
Demand for Declaring Qadianis as a Separate Minority	12
Behaviour of Persons in Power	14
Practice of Heresy among Muslims	15
Other Sects of Muslims	17
Political Ambitions of Qadianis	19
Plan for a Qadiani State in Pakistan	23
Demand for Separation by Majority	24
Truth about the Propagation of Islam by Qadianis	27
Loyalty to British Government	30
Motives Behind Propagations	33
Basic Features of Qadianism	36
Unanimous Demand by all Muslim Sects	40

APPENDIX I

Important Extracts from the First Statement of Maulana Syed Abul A'la Maududi in the Court of Enquiry	...	42
The Real Issue and its Background	...	42
Social Aspect	...	44
Economic Aspect	...	46
Political Aspect	...	47
Additional Causes of Acrimony	...	49
Inevitable Consequence	...	52
Provocation Caused by the Qadianis	...	54

APPENDIX II

Ulama's Amendments to the Basic Principles Report	...	59
---	-----	----

APPENDIX III

Iqbal on Qadianism	...	62
A Letter to the "Statesman"	...	65
Reply to the Questions Raised By Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru	...	70

APPENDIX IV

Verdicts of Judiciary	...	73
Judgement	...	74
Extracts from Maulana Syed Abul A'la Maududi's second Statement in the Court of Enquiry	...	76
The Nature of Demands Concerning the Qadianis is Political as well as Religious	...	76

THE QADIANI PROBLEM

In January 1953, thirty-three leading Ulama of Pakistan representing the various schools of thought among Muslims assembled in Karachi and formulated their amendments and proposals in regard to the recent constitutional recommendations of the B.P.C. Out of these an important proposal is to the effect that the followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani should be declared to constitute a minority, separate from the Muslims, and a seat in the Central Assembly should be reserved for them from the quota of the Punjab.

So far as Ulama's other amendments and proposals are concerned, they are obviously so sound and reasonable that none, not even those who oppose Ulama just for the sake of opposition, dared to say a word against them; and even if any forlorn voice was raised here or there it was no more than an outcome of frustration and defeatism and therefore it failed to create any impression on the minds of the intelligentsia.

But the case of their proposal in regard to the Qadianis is a little different. In spite of the fact that the proposal put forth by the Ulama is the best solution of the problem, a considerable section among the intelligentsia has failed to appreciate its soundness. Not only this. Even the masses—

except those of Punjab and Bahawalpur—have failed to realize fully the gravity of the problem and the soundness of the proposal. This is particularly true in the case of the masses of East Bengal.

We, therefore, propose to elucidate fully the arguments and reasons which led the Ulama to adopt the above proposal with complete unanimity of opinion.

Queer Interpretation of Khatm-e-Nabuwat

The first basic factor which completely alienates Qadianis from Muslims is their queer interpretation of the term *Khatam-un-Nabiyeen* as against the obvious and universally accepted interpretation of the term.

During the entire course of the last thirteen and a half centuries, Muslims have always believed, and so they do today, that Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) is the last messenger of God and that there can be no prophet after him. This is what the Companions of the Holy Prophet understood by the term *Khātām-un-Nabiyeen* as enunciated in the Holy Quran; and it was on account of this unshakable belief that they waged war against anybody who claimed to be a prophet. It has continued in all succeeding ages to be the universally accepted meaning of *Khātām-un-Nabiyeen* and the Ummat never spared anybody who came up as a claimant to prophethood. It is the Qadianis alone who have, for the first time in

the Muslim history, come forward with a novel interpretation of the term *Khatam-un-Nabiyeen*. According to them, it means that the Holy Prophet is the seal of prophethood, i.e., he is the seal for authenticating all subsequent prophethoods. The Qadiani literature abounds in such contentions. Suffice it here to quote only three passages :

“Referring to *Khatam-un-Nabiyeen*, Hazrat Masih-i-Mauood (alaihissalam) said that it (only) means that nobody’s prophethood could be deemed to be authentic unless it bears his (Muhammad’s) seal. Just as a document becomes authentic only when it has been duly sealed, similarly no prophethood is genuine unless it has been attested by and bears the seal of the Holy Prophet (Muhammad)”. (*Malfuzat-i-Ahmadia*, Vol. V, p. 290 edited by Manzur Elahi).

“We never deny that the Holy Prophet is *Khātam-un-Nabiyeen*. But *Khātam* does not mean what the “majority” of the Muslims understand it to be and which is derogatory to the highly elevated position and dignity of the Holy Prophet inasmuch as it is unthinkable that he should have deprived his followers of such a great blessing as that of prophethood. It (only) means that the Holy Prophet is the seal of the prophets. Now he alone can become a prophet who is certified by him (Muhammad) to be so. It is in this very sense that we

believe in Muhammad (God's peace be upon him) being *Khatam-un-Nabiyeen*" (*Al-Fazl*, Sep. 22, 1939).

"Khatam means seal. Now — how can the Holy Prophet be a seal if there is to be no prophet of and kind among his followers and where that seal is to be affixed?" (*Al-Fazl*, May 22, 1939).

This difference in the interpretation of the term *Khātām-un-Nabiyeen* did not remain a mere academic issue as regards the interpretation of a particular term. The Qadianis came forward with an open and unequivocal declaration that not one but thousands of prophets could come after the Holy Prophet. The following quotations will bear this out :

"It is as clear as daylight that the door of prophethood is open even after the Holy Prophet". (*Haqiqat-un-Nabuvvat*, p. 228, by *Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud*).

"They (the Muslims) think that the treasures of God have run out.....They say so because they do not comprehend the attributes of God. Otherwise what to say of one, I say thousands of prophets will come". (*Anwar-i-Khilafat*, p. 62 by *Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud*).

"If anybody puts my neck between two swords and asks me to declare that no prophet can come after Muhammad (peace be on him), I will say, 'You are a dirty liar'. There can

come numerous other prophets after the Holy Prophet Muhammad and certainly so".

(*Anwār-i-Khilāfat*, p. 65).

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's Claim to Prophethood

Thus Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, having opened the door of prophethood, paved the way for his own prophethood and then declared that he was a prophet. The Qadianis accepted him as a prophet in the real sense of the term. To illustrate we reproduce below a few out of the innumerable passages to this effect from authoritative Qadiani literature :

"And Hazrat Masih-i-Mauood (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) has himself stated in his books in very clear terms, his claim of prophethood. For instance, he says, 'I do claim that I am a prophet and an apostle'." (*Badr*, March 5, 1908).

"Then he says, 'I am a prophet under a divine decree. I shall be a sinner if I disclaim it..... And when God calls me a prophet, how can I deny it? I would stick to it to my last breath'. (See the letter of Hazrat Masih-i-Mauood to the Editor, *Akhbar-i-Am*). This letter of Hazrat Masih-i-Mauood was written only three days before his death, that is on May 23, 1908 and published in the *Akhbar-i-Am* dated the May 26th, 1908". (*Kalimat-ul-Faṣl* by Sahibzada Bashir Ahmad, published in *The Review of Religions*, No. 3, Vol. XIV, p. 110).

"Therefore, according to the recognized interpretation of the word 'prophet' held by the *ISLAMIC SHARIAT*, Hazrat Sahib (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) is a real and not a symbolic prophet". (*Haqiqat-un-Nabuvvat*, p. 147 by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad).

Consequences of Claim for Prophethood

The inevitable implication of a claim to prophethood is that any one who does not accept him as such automatically becomes a *KAFIR* (infidel); and as a matter of fact the Qadianis did exactly that and openly declared through their writings and speeches that those who do not believe in the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are *Kafirs*. Some of the quotations relevant from their writings and speeches are given below to substantiate the point:

"All Muslims who do not come under the *Baiat* of Hazrat Masih-i-Mauood (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) are *Kafirs* and outside the pale of Islam even though they might never have heard of him". (*Aina-e-Sadagat*, p. 35 by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad).

"Every such person who believes in Moses but does not believe in Jesus or believes in Jesus but does not believe in Muhammad or believes in Muhammad but does not believe in Masih-i-Mauood is not only *Kafir* (infidel) but a confirmed *Kafir* and is outside the pale of Islam". (*Kalimat-ul-Fasl* by Mirza Bashir

Ahmad, published in Review of Religions, No. 3, Vol. XIV, p. 110).

“As we believe the Mirza Sahib to be a prophet and non-Ahmadiis do not believe him to be a prophet, so they are *Kafirs* according to the Quranic teaching that the repudiation of even one of the prophets is *Kufr*”. (*Statement of Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad in the court of a Sub-Judge of Gurdaspur, vide Al-Fazl, 26/29 June, 1922*).

Religion of Qadianis is opposed to Islam

The Qadianis contend that the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is not the only issue on which they fundamentally differ from Muslims. They also hold that their God, their Islam, their Quran, their fasts, in fact everything of theirs is different from that of the Muslims. In his speech published in *Al-Fazl* dated August 21, 1917 under the caption “Advice to Students”, Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad told the Qadiani students :

“Hazrat Masih-i-Manood declared that their (Muslims’) Islam is other than that of ours. Their God is different from our God. Our pilgrimage (too) is different from their pilgrimage. In the same manner we differ from them in each and everything”.

In another speech, published in *Al-Fazl* dated July 30, 1931, Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad referred to a controversy which had arisen during the lifetime of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad whether the

Ahmadis should or should not start a separate institution for teaching theology. One group was of the opinion that they should not, because "we differ from other Muslims in regard to a few doctrines and these have been solved by Hazrat Masih-i-Mauood and he has also given his arguments therefor. As for the remaining things they could be learnt in other non-Ahmadi institutions". The other group held the opposite view. In the meanwhile Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself happened to reach the scene and after hearing the case he gave his own verdict which has been quoted by the Khalifa in the following words :

"It is wrong to say that our differences with others are confined to the theory of the death of Messiah or to a few other doctrines only. He (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) explained in detail how we differ from others in regard to the conception of Allah, of the Holy Prophet, of the Quran, of Prayers, of Fast, of Haj and of Zakat ; in short how we differ from them on everything".

Implications of New Religion

Again, this all-pervading difference was carried to its extreme logical results by the Qadianis themselves who severed all ties with Muslims and organised themselves collectively as a separate *Ummat*. The following evidences from Qadiani literature will bear this out ;

"Hazrat Masih-i-Mauood has strictly forbidden Ahmadis to offer prayers behind a non-Ahmadi. People from outside ask me this question repeatedly. I say, as many times as you put me this question my reply would be the same i.e., it is not permissible to offer prayers behind a non-Ahmadi. It is not permissible ; (and I reiterate) it is not permissible". (*Anwar-i-Khilafat* by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, Khalifa of Qadian, p. 89).

"It is obligatory on us to consider non-Ahmadis as non-Muslims and to offer prayers behind them because we consider them to be the repudiators of one of the prophets of Allah". (*Anwar-i-Khilafat*, p. 90).

"If a child of a non-Ahmadi dies, why should we not join his funeral prayer : after all, he was not a repudiator of Masih-i-Mauood ! Now I ask the questioner : if that is so, why not offer funeral prayers for the children of Hindus and Christians ? The child of a non-Ahmadi is also non-Ahmadi and therefore we should not offer funeral prayers even for him". (*Anwar-i-Khilafat*, p. 93).

"Hazrat Masih-i-Mauood has expressed strong resentment against an Ahmadi who give his daughter in marriage to a non-Ahmadi. A certain person repeatedly asked for permission in this behalf stating the pressure of circumstances that compelled him to do so,

but he (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) refused with the remark 'better let your daughter remain unmarried than give her in marriage to a non-Ahmadi'. After his (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's) death, when that same person married his daughter to a non-Ahmadi, the first caliph removed him from the *imamat* of Ahmadis, expelled him from the Ahmadi community and never, during his six years' regime of Caliphate, did he forgive him despite repeated demonstration of repentance on his part". (*Anwar-i-Khliafat*, pp. 93-94).

"Hazrat Masih-i-Mauood has allowed the same treatment in respect of non-Ahmadis as had been meted out to the Christians by the Holy Prophet. Our prayers have been separated from those of non-Ahmadis ; we have been forbidden to give our daughters in marriage to them ; we cannot offer funeral prayers for their dead. What else now remains common between them and us ? There are only two kinds of ties—religious and worldly. Common worship is the chief means of maintaining the religious tie and matrimony that of maintaining the worldly one. And both of these have been declared *Haram* for us. If you ask me, why, then, have we been permitted to take their daughters in marriage, my reply would be that we have been allowed to take the daughters of Christians as well. If you further ask me, why, then, do we say *Salam* to non-Ahmadis, I would reply that the Prophet

himself at times used to say *Salām* even to the Jews". (*Kalimat-ul-Fazl*, by *Mirza Bashir Ahmad*, 'Review of Religions', Vol. XIV, Nos. 3-4, p. 169).

Question : Is it permissible to say, on the death of a non-Ahmadi, 'May God admit the deceased into paradise ?'

Answer : The *Kufr* (heresy) of the non-Ahmadis is an established fact. And it is unlawful to pray for the salvation of *Kafirs*. (*Al-Fazl*, Feb. 7, 1921).

This cutting of ties is not merely of an academic nature confined to speeches and writings. It has been translated into action, and millions of people in Pakistan are witness to its practical demonstrations to the effect that Qadianis have, as a matter of fact, severed religious and social relations with the Muslims and have organised themselves into a separate and distinct *Ummat*.

The position being what it is, what reason on earth could there be to thrust Qadianis upon Muslims and forcibly tie them with the Muslim Community ? Why should not the fact of their separation be constitutionally recognised which has been there, in theory as well as in practice, for the last 50 years or so ?

In fact, the Qadiani movement has conclusively demonstrated the wisdom behind the doctrine of the Finality of Prophethood. Before the advent of this movement, it was rather difficult for the

Muslims of this age to appreciate why prophethood should have been brought to a close after Muhammad (God's peace be upon him); but the Qadiani movement has fully established that it is in fact greatest blessing of Allah upon the Muslims that He has united them under the banner of the prophethood of Muhammad (peace be on him), and has saved them permanently from disintegration. If the door of prophethood had been left open, prophet after prophet would have arisen from amongst the Muslims and disintegrated them into innumerable *Ummats*. Now, if we are willing to take a lesson from this experience and cut off this new *Ummat* of the Qadianis from the Muslims, no one will dare to come forward with the claim of prophethood and attempt at dividing the Muslims. In case we connive at this act of disintegration now, we will be guilty of encouraging others to make similar ventures tomorrow and thus expose ourselves to a gradual annihilation. This is how the toleration of today will serve as a precedent for tomorrow and the Muslim society will have to face many disruptive movements of the same type.

Demand for Declaring Qadianis as a Separate Minority

This is the main argument for the demand that the Qadianis be declared a separate minority quite apart from the Muslims. None, so far, has come forward with a convincing argument against this. Some irrelevant objections and excuses have,

however, been raised from time to time to divert the attention of the people from the real issue. For example :—

(1) It is said that there have always been among the different sections of Muslims natural accusations of heresy and this is so even in the present case. If this process of rejecting of different schools of thought from the *Ummat* is to go on like that, the Muslim society itself will cease to exist. In this connection it is further argued that there are a number of other sects too that differ fundamentally from the Muslim majority in regard to their respective creeds and have set up their social organisations, quite apart from the Muslims and have, like the Qadianis, cut off all their religious and social relations with them. Should they also be declared separate minorities ? Or, is this demand confined to the Qadianis alone ? After all what wrong have the Qadianis done to the exclusion of others that they alone should be made the target ?

(2) Another objection which has been raised in this connection is that it is rather strange that the majority should be pressing for its separation from the minority in the face of the latter's opposition. Why not leave it to the minority to come up with this demand if it needs any protection against the majority.

(3) There are still others who are of the opinion that Qadianis have rendered meritorious services in the defence of Islam against the Christians and the

Arya Samajists in the initial stages of their movement and they are even now propagating Islam throughout the world. They, therefore, do not deserve the harsh treatment which is being meted out to them.

(4) Lastly, we have recently come to learn that in the opinion of those at the helm of national affairs, such a step against the Qadianis is likely to prove detrimental to the best interests of our country. Their contention is that the Qadiani Foreign Minister wields such a great personal influence in England and America that it is through his good offices that we could, if at all, benefit from these countries.

Behaviour of Persons in Power

Let us now analyse and consider these issues one by one. I take up the last one first on account of its brevity.

If this, in fact, is the line of argument adopted by those in power today, the sooner the country is rescued from the leadership of such fools the better. If they think that the destiny of this country is tied to the tail of some particular individual or of a group of persons in the present cabinet, they are not at all worthy of being at the helm of affairs of this country even for a single moment. Do they think that the people of other countries like America and England assess the importance of a country in terms of whether or not she happens to have a certain person as its Foreign Minister? Do they not realise

the importance of Pakistan on account of its 80 million people, its vast resources, and its strategic position ? Is it thinkable that as soon as the present Qadiani Foreign Minister is removed from office, England and America would be so offended that their relations with Pakistan would be strained and they will stop all aid or assistance that they would otherwise give to this country ?

The fact is that the Qadiani Foreign Minister owes his importance not to his personal ability but to the fact that he is the Foreign Minister of an important country like 'Pakistan'. It is not Pakistan which has gained in importance because of Sir Zafarullah Khan, but the latter who has risen to this eminence because of his being the Foreign Minister of Pakistan.

Now we proceed to the rest of the objections one by one. Let us start with the first one.

Practice of Heresy among Muslims

There can, of course, be no denying the fact that Muslim Society has been a victim to the disease of mutual accusations of heresy among the various sects and that even now there are some that indulge in this unpropitious occupation. But this can in no case, as will be explained presently, provide an excuse for keeping the Qadianis forcibly tied to our Muslim Society.

Firstly, the misuse of the epithet of heretic in certain cases cannot justify the conclusions that all verdicts of heresy must necessarily be wrong and

that nobody should, in any case whatsoever, be declared a *Kafir*, howsoever flagrantly opposed to Islam his views may be. Just as it is wrong to dub anybody as *Kafir* simply because he happens to have certain differences on some minor issues not affecting the fundamentals of Islam, it would be equally wrong to continue to consider a person Muslim even though he may flagrantly repudiate the very fundamental principles and tenets of Islam. As for those who seem to hold that because there are to be found instances of the unwarranted application of the epithet of heresy, this epithet should be altogether abandoned, one would ask whether they really mean to say that even if somebody claims divinity or prophethood or openly repudiates the very fundamentals of Islam, he should despite all that deserve to remain a Muslim?

Secondly, it would be remembered that leading Ulama of those very schools of thought among Muslims whose so called mutual accusations of heresy are being so much trumpeted and put forth as an argument in connection with the Qadiani issue, assembled in Karachi in the recent past and by complete unanimity of opinion, formulated the basic principles of an Islamic State. Obviously enough they did consider one another as Muslim or else how could they sit together and accomplish what they did with complete unanimity of opinion amongst themselves? What more proof could be needed to establish that, even though certain beliefs held by one group may be heretical in the opinion

of another, they do not consider or hold one another as outside the pale of Islam. Therefore it is quite fantastic to say that the excommunication of Qadianis would be followed by a series of expulsions, from the *ummat*, of a number of groups.

Thirdly, the Qadiani issue is altogether of a different character from that of the mutual accusation of heresy among the various sects. The Qadianis have established a new prophethood which inevitably divides the believers and non-believers into separate *ummahs*. That is why the Qadianis are unanimous in their verdict of *kufr* against all Muslims and all the Muslims are unanimous in their verdict of *kufr* against Qadianis. Obviously this is a difference of an absolutely fundamental nature, which cannot be placed on the same footing as that of the mutual differences amongst Muslims in regard to minor issues.

Other Sects of Muslims

It is also a fact that besides the Qadianis, there are other sects too who differ from the majority of the Muslims in regard to some of the fundamentals of Islam, and that they have cut off religious and social relations with them and organised themselves into separate communities. But their case is altogether different from that of the Qadianis. They have merely isolated themselves from the general body of Muslims; they are like small rocks scattered on the borderline. Their existence, therefore, can be to-

lerated. But the Qadianis penetrate into the Muslim Society posing as Muslims ; they propagate their views in the name of Islam ; start controversies everywhere, carry on proselytizing propaganda in an aggressive manner and continuously strive to swell their numbers at the expense of the Muslim Society. They have thus become a permanent disintegrating force among the Muslims. How can it, therefore, be possible to show the same kind of toleration towards them as is shown towards other passive sects ?

The problem of those sects is, after all, rather a theological problem, i.e., whether or not to include them in the pale of Islam in view of their specific creeds. Even if it is decided that they are outside the pale of Islam, their survival as a passive element of the Muslim Society cannot do any harm to the Muslims religiously, economically or politically. On the other hand, the continuous propagation of the Qadiani creed is a constant menace to the religion of the millions of ignorant Muslims. Moreover, it has created many a social problem for the Muslim Society. It has separated husbands from wives, fathers from sons, and brothers from brothers. In addition to this, it has developed acute economic rivalries between the Qadianis and the Muslims. The Qadiani community as a separate group is opposing the *Muslims* in Government offices, in the fields of commerce, industry, and agriculture, etc. This has created problems of various types besides the social problem.

Political Ambitions of Qadianis

Again the other sects have not shown such political tendencies as might be dangerous for the *Millat* and may, on this account call for our immediate attention. The Qadianis have, on the other hand, evinced some dangerous political trends which must receive prompt attention.

From the very beginning of the movement, the Qadianis have been fully conscious of the fact that the claim of a new prophethood can never flourish in any independent Muslim State. They know it full well that Muslims naturally detest such claims on account of their disruptive effects on the solidarity of the *ummat*. They are also aware of the treatment which has been meted out to such impostors ever since the advent of Islam. They know it from the history of Islam that new prophethoods have never been allowed to flourish in Muslim States. They could, thus, never expect that their new prophethood would be allowed to prosper in any independent Muslim Society. They know it well that their new prophethood could only flourish under a non-Muslim Government which, subject to an assurance of their loyalty would gladly allow them freedom to proffer any claims in the domain of religion and to sow seeds of dissension among the Muslims. It very much suits their interest that Muslims should always remain under the heels of the non-Muslims and then alone would they have a chance to play their game freely. Obviously the Muslims alone can fall a prey to them for their

appeal is in the name of Islam. They, therefore, want them to remain under the domination on non-Muslim rule so that they could freely and fearlessly exploit the Muslim Millat. That is why they have always proclaimed unconditional and unalloyed loyalty to the non-Muslim Governments while an independent and free Muslim State can never be a source of pleasure to them.

Several statements of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers can be cited in proof of this fact. A few are given below :—

“In fact, we owe a heavy debt of gratitude to this (British) Government. If we quit (this realm) even Mecca or Constantinople would not give us refuge. How can, then, we cherish in our hearts any idea against it”? (*Mulfuzat-i-Ahmadiya, Vol. I, p. 146*).

“I can carry on my mission neither in Mecca nor in Medina nor in Turkey nor in Syria nor in Iran nor in Kabul but only under this Government for whose prosperity and progress I offer prayers”. (*Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Tabligh-i-Risalat, Vol. VI, p. 69*).

“Just ponder ; where on earth is there a haven for you if you quit the patronage of this Government ? You cannot simply think of even one Government which will take you under its protection. Every Islamic State is gnashing its teeth for cutting you to pieces because you are disbelievers and renegades in their

sight. You should be grateful for this blessing of God. You must clearly understand that God has established the British Government in this country for your good only. If a misfortune befalls this Government that will exterminate you (Qadianie) also.....Just try to live under any other Government and you will realize what treatment is meted out to you. Lend your ears to me ! The British Government is a divine favour, a blessing of God and a shield for you. So you should be grateful for this from the very core of your hearts. The English are a thousand times better than our Muslim opponents because they do not believe that we deserve to be put to death, and they do not want to dishonour you". (*An Important Advice to My Community—by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad—published in Tabligh-i-Risalut, Vol. X, p. 123*).

"It is not hidden from those who have read the history of nations how the Iranian Government mercilessly persecuted Mirza Ali Muhammad Bab, the founder of the Babi Sect, and his helpless followers merely on account of religious differences. This too is not hidden from those who keep in touch with the current world events what treatment was meted out to Bahaullah, the founder of the Babia Bahaia Sect and his exiled followers by the Turkish Government (which calls itself a European State) from 1863 to 1892 in Constantinople, Adrianople

and Acre jails. And these three (presumably Afghanistan is the third) are considered to be the greatest (Muslim) States in the world. The narrow-mindedness and the religious intolerance shown by these three in this civilized age cannot but convince the *Ahmadi Nation* that their liberty is linked with the British Crown.....That is why all the true Ahmadis who believe in Hazrat Mirza Sahib as a man appointed by God and a holy personality, also believe—from the core of their hearts and without any flattery—that the British Government is a Divine blessing and mercy for them. They therefore identify themselves totally and absolutely with it". (*Al-Fazl*, September 13, 1914).

The above quotations prove beyond doubt that bondage to the infidels which, according to us, is the greatest calamity that can befall a Muslim nation, is a blessing for this new prophet and his followers. And the reason for this is not far to seek. None but a non-Muslim and foreign Government can permit freely the growth of new prophet-hoods in Muslim Society and encourage or connive at such religious and social dissensions as are intended to disintegrate the *Millat*. An independent Muslim State is, so to say, a misfortune for them for it can never willingly tolerate the destruction of its own religion and the disintegration of its own social structure.

Plan for a Qadiani State in Pakistan

The most sinister conspiracy is that this tendency of the Qadianis is taking a new turn after the establishment of Pakistan. They are planning to establish a Qadiani State within the State of Pakistan. Full one year had not yet passed since the establishment of Pakistan, when the Qadiani Khalifa in an address delivered at Quetta on July 23, 1948, which has been published in *Al-Fazl* dated August 13, 1948, gave the following advice to his followers :—

“The entire population of British Baluchistan—now called Pak Baluchistan—is about five or six lakhs. Although the population of this Province is less than that of others, it has an importance of its own as a unit has the same value in a state as an individual has in a society. To illustrate one may refer to the Constitution of America. In America, every state is represented by an equal number of members in the Senate irrespective of its population which may be one crore or ten crores. In short, although the population of Pak Baluchistan is only 5-6 lakhs or 11 lakhs including the States, it has its importance as a unit. It is difficult to convert a big population to Ahmadism but it is easy to convert a small population. If, therefore, the Community pays full attention to this programme, this province can be converted over to Ahmadism in a very short time. Remember ; our missionary work can never succeed unless

we have a strong base. A strong base is a prerequisite for *Tabligh*. Therefore, you should first of all try to make your base strong. Have a base of your own somewhere. Let it be anywhere. If we convert the whole of this province to Ahmadiism, we shall be in a position to call at least one province as our own. And this can be done very easily”.

This speech is self-explanatory. We would like to ask those who plead that the case of the Qadianis should be considered on the same footing as that of other sects ; is there any other sect which has such designs as the above ? Does any one of them consider non-Muslim domination beneficial for its creed ? Has any one of them a similar design to build a state of its own within our state ? If there is none—and most certainly there is none—why should their case be treated on the same manner as that of the Qadianis ?

Demand for Separation by Majority

Now let us take the third objection, i.e., the demand for separation is generally made by those in a minority, while here it is just the reverse and it is the majority and not the minority that has come up with the demand of separation.

We would ask those who raise this objection to cite some verse from any political Bible in support of their notion that as a rule only the minorities can put up a demand for separation and the majorities are totally forbidden to do so.

As a matter of common-sense, demands are always the creation of necessities and are presented by those who stand in need of them. The only thing that should weigh in regard to a demand is whether it is reasonable or not. In the present case the demand of separation has been put forth by the majority because it is the majority that is the sufferer. It has, therefore, put forth the demand that this *de facto* minority should be constitutionally declared to be a distinct minority group. On the one hand, this minority group enjoys all the privileges which accrue to it by dint of its virtual separation from the society, while on the other, it grabs all the advantages of being a part of the majority. On the one hand, it has cut itself off from the Muslims both religiously and socially, has organised itself into a separate community and stands as their rival in every walk of life and is virtually proceeding on the maxim 'Heads I win, tails you lose'. On the other hand, it penetrates into the Muslim Society in the garb of Muslims, swells its numbers by means of subtle propaganda, causes religious and social dissensions among Muslims and grabs a good deal more than its due in the various walks of collective life. It is clear that in the circumstances, it is the majority which is the loser. For the minority it is all gain. That is why the demand for separation is being passed by the majority and not by the minority.

When all has been said, it would be interesting for the readers to note the contents of the following

extracts from a statement of Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmood, the Head of the Qadiani Ummat, published about ten months before the establishment of Pakistan—

“I sent word, through a representative of mine to a highly responsible British Officer, to the effect that our rights too should be recognised like those of Parsees and Christians. The officer thereupon said : “They are minorities, while you are a religious sect”. I said : “Our separate rights should be recognised just as theirs have been recognised. For every one Parsee I would produce two Ahmadis”. (*Al-Fazl* dated November 13, 1946).

This demand of being recognised as a separate minority like Parsees and Christians was made by the Head of the Qadianis at a time when there was an Interim Ministry consisting of the representatives of the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League.

We have quoted the above just to expose the colossal ignorance of those who plead against the *Millat's* demand without taking the trouble to study the facts relevant to, and the implications of such vital issues. For us it is a matter of little significance whether the demand came from the majority or from the minority. What weighs with us is whether or not the demand is based on solid grounds.

How, under these circumstances, the majority can be blamed for the stand it has taken on this issue ? And who can justify the attitude of the powers that be and their attempt to meet this most reasonable demand of the majority by sheer brute force ? It is in fact the duty of every sensible man endowed with common-sense to find out why, after all, a minority, which has at its own initiative broken all sorts of social and religious ties with the majority, has organized itself into a separate religious and social order, which demanded, not long ago, separate rights for itself and wanted to be placed on the same footing as Christians and Parsees, should now so strongly persist to remain politically within the fold of the majority. Why, after all, it is trying to evade the logical results of its own deeds. And if it is trying to take advantage of the majority, how is it that the representatives of the majority are joining hands with that minority ?

Truth about the Propagation of Islam by Qadianis

Now let us take the last objection raised in this connection. It is said that the Qadianis deserve a better treatment at the hands of the Muslims for they have all along been defending and propagating Islam. That is a grave misunderstanding which is usually prevalent among the modern educated section. We would request all such persons to take the trouble of carefully perusing the following quotations from the writings of none else than Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the founder of Qadianism,

and to ascertain for themselves the real state of affairs regarding the Qadiani propaganda in this behalf. These quotations in a clear manner expose the real objective behind all their missionary work for Islam. In *Tiryag-ul-Quloob* printed at Maktaba-i-Zia-ul-Islam, Qadian (October 28, 1902), under the caption 'A Humble Petition to the Government', Mirza Ghulam Ahmad says :—

“For the last twenty years, I have been publishing books in Persian, Arabic, Urdu and English, in which I have been repeatedly and passionately persuading the Muslims to become sincerely loyal subjects of the Government. It is their duty and, if they do not fulfil it they will be sinning against God. I have also been insisting upon them to discard absurd notions like those of *jihad* and of a blood-thirsty *Mehdi* which have no basis in the *Qur'an*. Even if they are not prepared to give up these wrong notions, the least they are in duty bound to do in this sphere is that they should not show ingratitude to this benign Government and should not become sinners against God by committing any act of disloyalty against it”. (P. 307).

In the same 'Humble Petition', he further implored the Government in the following words:—

“Now I can confidently submit to my benign Government that the services that I have rendered during the twenty long years

far surpass those of any other Muslim family in the whole of British India. It is also obvious that a pressing and continuous propagation of the same ideas for twenty long years could not possibly be the result of any duplicity or selfishness on my part. It could only be the work of a man who is sincerely loyal to this Government. I do confess that I have at times been entering into controversies with the followers of other religions and have published books against the Christian missionaries. I furthermore confess that I did write some strongly worded books in reply to the aggressive literature of the Christian missionaries against Islam, particularly when *Nur Afshan*, a Christian paper from Ludhiana, published some indecent articles against the Holy Prophet.....I was alarmed lest these writings should incite the fanatic element among the Muslims. *Under these circumstances I rightly and sincerely thought that in order to cool down the Wrath of the Muslims the best policy would be to give a strongly worded reply to such writings.* So I did this to appease this wrath and to avert breach of peace in the country. I wrote a few strongly worded books in order to counteract the effects of the extremely harsh books against Islam. I did so in response to the voice of my conscience which categorically dictated that this was the only way to extinguish the fire of

anger of the followers of Islam who were under the sway of wild passions". (pp. 308, 309).

He elucidates his position further in the following words :—

The motive of all I have done against the Christian missionaries was to appease tactfully the wild element among the Muslims. Thus I can safely assert that, of all the Muslims, I am the most loyal to the British Government. There are three factors which have contributed to make me a first-rate loyalist, namely (1) the influence of my late father (2) the munificence of the British Government and (3) revelations from God". (pp. 309-310).

Loyalty to British Government

In the Appendix to another book, *Shahadat-ul-Quran*, printed at Punjab Press, Sialkot (6th Edition), he writes as follows under the caption, 'For the Immediate Attention of the Government' :

"I have repeatedly declared that, according to my creed, Islam consists of two parts—(1) obedience to God and (2) obedience to the Government which has established peace and given us protection from the tyranny of the aggressors, and that is the British Government".

A petition of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, addressed to 'His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor', in *Tabligh-i-Risalat*, Vol. VII, printed at Faruq

Press, Qadian (August 1922), makes a very interesting reading. In this petition he has tried to prove the unalloyed loyalty of his family by referring to certificates of merit awarded to his father Mirza Ghulam Murtaza by the Commissioner, Lahore Division, the Financial Commissioner, Punjab and other British officers, for the meritorious services rendered by him to the British Government. He also reiterates the loyal services of the other members of his family and then goes on to say :—

“Throughout my life from my early age up to this day when I am about sixty, I have kept myself busy in the task of sowing in the minds of the Muslims the seeds of sincere love, good wishes and sympathy for the British Government and in trying to wipe out wrong notions like *Jihad* etc., from the minds of the foolish among them, as it is these ideas that prevent them from establishing an open-hearted and sincere link with this government”.
(p. 10).

He proceeds further to say :—

“I have not only made the Muslims of British India sincerely obedient to the British Government. I have also written a number of books in Arabic, Persian and Urdu to apprise Muslims of other Islamic countries of the peace, prosperity and freedom under the benevolent protection of the British Government”. (p. 10).

Then he gives a long list of books which bear proof of his loyal services and implores the Government, saying :—

“Let the Government ascertain through inquiry whether or not it is a fact that thousands of Muslims who dub me as a *Kafir* and who deem it their duty to condemn and persecute me and my followers who are to be found in large numbers in the Punjab and India. One of the reasons behind this attitude is that, quite against the sentiments of these foolish Muslims, I published thousands of posters to demonstrate heartfelt gratitude to the British Government and sent (similar) books to Arabia, Syria, etc. My claims are not without proof. If the Government so likes, I can produce conclusive proof in support thereof. I say this with all the force at my command and declare it before the Government that of all the sects of Muslims this new sect on the basis of its religious principles is the most loyal and devoted to the Government and none of its principles constitutes a danger for the Government” (p. 13).

Further on, he writes :—

“It is my conviction that as the number of my followers increases, the number of the believers in *Jihad* will decrease, because the belief in me as *Masih* and *Mehdi* automatically leads to the denial of *Jihad*”. (p. 17).

Motives Behind Propagation

Leaving aside, for the moment the question whether this could be the tone, expression and language of a prophet, we would only ask whether anybody, after learning from the Mirza himself the aims and objects underlying his defence and propagation of Islam and the Muslim cause, could dare say that the Qadianis have rendered any service in this field. They have throughout sabotaged the cause of Islam and the Muslims. If despite all this, doubt still lingers in the mind of a reader, let him read with open eyes what the Qadianis themselves confess :—

“After a long time, I happened to come across a book in a library which had gone out of print. It was written by an Italian Engineer, who held a responsible post in Afghanistan. He says that Sahibzada Abdul Latif (Qadiani) was assassinated (in Afghanistan) because he preached against *Jihad*. The Afghan Government was afraid lest this preaching should extinguish the flame of liberty burning in the hearts of the Afghans and lead to British domination over them.....This statement coming as it does from such an authentic source conclusively proves that if Sahibzada Abdul Latif had refrained from preaching against *Jihad*, the Afghan Government would not have felt the necessity of putting him to death”. (*A Friday Sermon by Mirza*

Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood Ahmad published in Al-Fazl, dated August 6, 1935).

"The Home Minister to the Afghanistan Government published the following communique: 'Two Kabulis, Mulla Nur Ali, shopkeeper and Mulla Abdul Halim Chahar Aasiani had embraced the Qadiani creed and were occupied in misleading the people from the right path.....Another case also had been pending against them for along time and treacherous letters from foreigners against the interests of the Afghan Government were found in their possession. This shows that they had sold themselves to the enemies of Afghanistan'. (Quoted from Aman Afghan in Al-Fazl dated March 3, 1925).

"Although I had gone to Russia for the propagation of Ahmadism, yet I served the interests of the British Government also along with my preaching, because the interest of the Ahmadia Sect and those of the British Government are closely inter-woven". (Statement of M. Muhammad Amin Qadiani missionary, Al-Fazl, September 28, 1922).

"The whole world considers us to be the agents of the British. That is why an explanation was called from a German Minister, when he attended the opening ceremony of the Ahmadia Building in Germany, as to why

he had attended the celebration of community which was the agent of the British". *Friday Sermon by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood Ahmad—Al-Fazi, dated November 1, 1834*).

"We hope that with the expansion of the British Empire the field for the propagation of Islam for us will also expand and along with the conversion of the non-Muslims we shall also be able to preach among the Muslims to become Muslims again". (*Comments on "Lord Harding's Travels Iraq"—Al-Fazi dated February 11, 1910*).

"As a matter of fact, the British Government is a shield under the protection of which the Ahmadi sect goes on advancing further and further. Just move away from this shield and you will be pierced by a volley of poisoned arrows from all directions. Why shouldn't then we be grateful to this Government? 'Our interests are linked with this Government to such an extent that its ruin will be our ruin and its progress our progress. Wherever the British empire spreads, we find a field for our mission'. (*Al-Fazi, dated October 19, 1915*).

"The relations of the Ahmadiya Community with the British Government are of a quite different nature from those of the other communities. Our circumstances have interwoven our interests with those of this Government.

The farther the British rule spreads the more chances do we get for advancing forward. And, God forbid, if this Government suffers a set-back we too will not escape its consequences". (*A Declaration by Khalifa-i-Qadian, Al-Fazl, July 27, 1918*).

Basic Features of Qadianism

A full picture of the Qadiani Movement is now before the reader. To sum up, the following are its basic features :

(1) Some fifty years ago, when Muslims were groaning under the British yoke, one Mirza Ghulam Ahmad appeared in the Punjab and put forth the claim of Prophethood. He contended that henceforward belief in the unity of Allah and the Prophethood of Muhammad (peace of God be on him) were not enough to make one a Muslim. To be a Muslim one must believe in his (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's) Prophethood also. He insisted that a person who did not believe in his Prophethood was a *Kafir* and hence outside the pale of Islam, even if such a person believed in the unity of God or in the Prophethood of all the Prophets from Adam to Muhammad (peace and blessings be on him), or in all the Revealed Books down to the Holy Quran and in the Day of Judgement.

(2) On the basis of the above he created a new criterion of *Kufr* and *Iman* in the Muslim Society, and began to organize those who believed in him

into a separate *Ummat*. This naturally placed them in the position of an altogether new community as distinctly separate from the Muslims as the Hindus and Christians, because neither the articles of faith nor worship, nor intermarriages were left common between them and the Muslims.

(3) The founder of this religion appears to have realised in the very beginning of his adventure that the Muslim Society would never reconcile itself to this disintegration from within. Therefore he, and his successors, deliberately adopted the attitude of unalloyed loyalty and devotion towards the British masters of the country not only as a policy but as an article of faith. In view of the stand they had taken against the Muslims and Islam, they rightly understood that their interests were closely linked with the supremacy of the non-Muslims, therefore they genuinely struggled for its perpetuation, not only in India, but also in the Muslim world abroad. They tried their best to see that the independent Muslim countries come under the British sway so that they could find fertile fields for their new religion.

(4) Thus, with the help of foreign rulers, this community succeeded throughout in setting at naught all the efforts of the Muslims during the last fifty years to excommunicate if from the Muslim Society. And the British Government, in spite of a full awareness of the fact that this community differed in each and every respect from

Muslims and had organised itself against them, insisted upon their being treated as part and parcel of the Muslim Community. This attitude of the foreign rulers proved very helpful to the Qadianis while it tremendously harmed the Muslims in the following manner :—

- (a) In spite of all the efforts of the *Ulama*, many an ignorant Muslim failed to appreciate the true intentions Qadianis and remained a victim to the idea that Qadianism was only a new school of thought within the fold of Islam and not an altogether new religion and that Qadianis too were a sect of Islam and a part of the Muslim Society. This false impression made the spread of Qadianism much easier in the Muslim Society because the ignorant Muslims did not realise that the entrance into the fold of Qadianism meant the renunciation of Islam and acceptance of an entirely new religion. It was thus that the Qadianis went on swelling their ranks at the expense of the Muslim Community, and it was because of this that they always resented, and still resent the Muslim's demand that they should be recognized as a minority, altogether separate from Muslims. As this wave of disintegration took its birth and flourished in the Punjab, therefore it was this part of the country which was the worst hit by its repercussion and suffered most in this respect. This explains also why the

Muslims of the Punjab are so vehemently against the movement.

- (b) Under the patronage of the British, the Qadianis posing as Muslims, grabbed the most of posts in the Army, Police, Judiciary and other services from out of the quota allocated for the Muslims. Whenever the Muslims cried for their share in the services they were told that they were receiving their due share, while in fact, it was the Qadianis who were receiving most of this share and not the Muslims with whom they were competing as rivals in every sphere of life as an organized opposing force. Similar was the case in the economic life of the country—industrial, commercial or agricultural, etc.

(5) Now, after the establishment of Pakistan, the Qadiani community has fully realized that an independent Muslim Society cannot and will not tolerate this state of affairs for long. It is, therefore, struggling hard to dig its roots deeper and stronger in every sphere of national life. On the one hand all the Qadianis, holding high offices, are recruiting their co-religionists in every governmental department and on the other hand they are helping to make their economic position as strong as possible so that Muslims in spite of possessing an independent state of their own may not be able to do anything that might adversely affect the interests of Qadianis. At the same time they are also employ-

ing most of their resources and devoting their best attention particularly to Baluchistan in the hope that they might be able to turn it into a state of their own.

Unanimous Demand by all Muslim Sects

These are the reasons which have forced the Muslims belonging to the various schools of thought to come together and to demand unanimously the expulsion in a constitutional manner of the Qadianis from the Muslim Community, for they are like a cancer eating up and gradually consuming the vitals of the Muslim Society. They also demand the removal of Sir Zafarullah Khan from Foreign Ministership because he is the main prop of the Qadiani mission and is misusing his high position both in Pakistan and abroad for the spread of the Qadiani influence. They further demand that the Qadianis should be removed from key-posts and their proportion fixed in services according to their population.

In the light of these arguments can any one dare justify the stand of the Qadianis or that of the powers that be who are vainly trying to step into the shoes of the Qadianis' foreign patrons? It is a pity that our intelligentsia too, who ought to have itself taken up this issue, is still a victim to the mischievous propaganda of the Qadianis and takes this demand of the Millat as the outcome of a sectarian strife enflamed by the '*Mullas*'. We

have fully explained the grounds on which this demand is based and now we would ask those opposing this demand to come forward with their arguments and then decide the issue in a square manner on logical grounds. If they do not do so—and they cannot do so—they would themselves be guilty of the worst type of ‘mullaism’ of which they accuse others so much. We would also ask those who are at the helm of affairs of this country to give up the policy of flouting popular demands held so dear by an overwhelming majority of the people. That alone is the best and sensible course for them and for the nation and country.

In the end we deem it our duty to condemn, with all the emphasis at our command, the immoral and destructive methods that were adopted to push up, and secure the acceptance of, this demand. But, at the same time, I find no words strong enough to condemn those who rule the country in sheer ignorance of her problems—exactly as the foreigners did—and who are dealing with a national problem in such a crude manner that instead of solving the problem in hand, they are creating several new problems for the nation and country.

APPENDIX I

IMPORTANT EXTRACTS FROM THE FIRST STATEMENT OF MAULANA SYED ABUL 'ALA MAUBUDI IN THE COURT OF ENQUIRY

The Real Issue and its Background

(1) The schism between the Qadianis and the Muslims dates back to the beginning of the twentieth century. Although Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had been putting forth various claims until the close of the nineteenth century, and these claims had caused a wave of general unrest among the Muslims, he had not until then made a definite claim to be a prophet. In 1902, he declared himself to be a prophet in concrete, clear, and definite terms. This claim began a perpetual dispute between the followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and the majority of Muslims.

The fundamental cause of this dispute is that Prophethood is one of the essential articles of faith in Islam. When a person claims to be a prophet, it becomes obligatory on every Muslim to make a choice : to believe in him or to repudiate him. Those who affirm faith in him automatically come to form a separate *Ummah*, and in their view all those disbelieving in him turn infidels. On the

other hand, this latter group of people who disbelieve in him come to form a community distinct from those professing belief in him. This group of people look upon those who, according to them, affirm faith in a false prophet as infidels. This is the main reason why the cleavage between the followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and those who repudiate his claim to prophethood has steadily widened. The Mirza and his successors in their writings and speeches openly and categorically declared as pagans all those who disbelieved in the prophethood of the Mirza. Similarly, all religious schools of thought among the Muslims—including the Sunnis and the Shias, the Ahl-i-Hadis, Hanafis, Deo-Bandi and Brelvi—unanimously proclaimed Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers as infidels.

(2) This dispute has been growing more and more intense by the following three reasons :

Firstly, the missionary activities of the followers of this new 'religion' and their constant tendency to enter into acrimonious arguments and controversy. Because of this, each individual member of this community has been responsible for creating an atmosphere of permanent tension in his surroundings.

Secondly, these missionary activities, debates and controversies have generally been directed against the Muslims. Naturally, therefore, it is the Muslims who have been provoked.

Thirdly, the Qadianis pose as members of the Muslim fraternity and carry on their propaganda work in the name of Islam. Ignorant Muslims therefore, feel no scruples in entering the fold of the Qadianis, because they are deceived thinking that by so doing they are not renouncing their faith in Islam. This state of affairs is even more provocative to the Muslims than the proselytising activities of the Christians or the followers of other religions. The activities of the Christian or other missionaries are comparatively less offensive, because the aims of their missionaries are unambiguous and the Muslim converts to their religion have a clear understanding that they are leaving the fold of Islam once and for all.

Social Aspect

(3) In the beginning, Qadianism was only a theological dispute, but soon it developed into an intricate and bitter social problem. The *fatwa* issued by the Mirza and his successors which decreed that the relations between the Ahmadis and the non-Ahmadis were of the same order as those between the Muslims and the Christians or the Jews became the main cause of social strike among the Muslim community. In accordance with the doctrine of this *fatwa*, an Ahmadi is forbidden to offer prayers behind a non-Ahmadi. It is unlawful for an Ahmadi to offer funeral prayers for a non-Ahmadi or his child. The Ahmadi is permitted to take into marriage the daughter of a non-Ahmadi,

but is forbidden to give his own daughter to a non-Ahmadi. The Muslims reacted to this *fatwa* by enforcing similar measures against the Ahmadis. A state of social boycott thus came to prevail between the two communities. The schism caused in the Muslim Society by this boycott was not a temporary and transitory phenomenon ; it marked an ever-growing and ever-widening gulf between the Ahmadis and the Muslims. Qadianism was an active missionary movement and it was creating disruption among Muslim families by its constant proselytising activities. Accompanied with its doctrine of social boycott of the non-Ahmadis, wherever it had a chance to creep in—in a home, family, village, clan or community—the Qadiani movement sowed the seeds of discord and conflict everywhere. Imagine the bitterness created in a society where husbands begin to consider their wives as forbidden to them and wives start looking upon their husbands as men with whom intercourse is unlawful or at least both husbands and wives begin to suspect the sanctity of their relationships. Think of the misery created in a society where a brother refuses to offer funeral prayers for the child of a real brother, where the son considers his father a heretic and the father treats his son as an apostate ; and where matrimonial relations within a family group or a community are severed.

These sores of society have gone from bad to worse with the increasing pace of Qadiani propaganda over the last fifty years. The Punjab has

been the worst sufferer, for here thousands of families have been afflicted by the venom of the Qadiani movement.

Economic Aspect

(4) Soon this conflict between the Muslims and the Qadianis manifested itself in the economic field too. Owing to their religious and social friction with the Muslims and to a large extent because of their fanaticism, Qadianis had from the very outset developed a tendency of flocking together. They organised themselves and initiated a scheme of giving precedence to the Qadianis over the non-Qadianis and of generally promoting the interests of one another in every sphere of economic life. This policy of the Qadianis sharpened even more the bitter conflict already existing between them and the Muslims. The bitterness of this conflict has been more pronounced in the matter of securing Government jobs. The practice of nepotism widely prevalent among the Qadiani State officials has aggravated the matter still further. In this respect also, the Punjab has been the greatest victim of the Qadianis, because their sizeable number are residents of the Punjab and it is in this Province that the acrimonious dispute has largely existed between the Muslims and the Qadianis in the fields of agriculture, trade, industry, and Government services. It should not be forgotten at this point that this strife between the Muslims and the Qadianis is of the same nature as in the recent past drove a wedge

between the Muslims and the Hindus and consequently carried them to the extremes of enmity.

Political Aspect

(5) Political conflict is the natural outgrowth of religious, social and economic friction between two communities. However, the causes of political strife between the Qadianis and the Muslims go deeper. The Mirza and his followers recognised from the very beginning that the claim to prophethood which they had advanced would create a dichotomy of Faith and Disbelief in the Muslim Society. They were also well aware that over a period of twelve centuries, from the time of Hadrat Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him) down to the regimes of Qachari and Usmani dynasties, the Muslim community had effectively crushed all disruptive elements. From the early days of the movement, therefore, they made loyalty to the British Government as an article of their faith, and not only by word of mouth but also with sincere conviction they always believed that their security, development, welfare and success depended entirely on the merciful protection of a non-Muslim Government. "The Muslims should for ever remain abject slaves under the imperial rule of non-Muslims. The Qadianis should owe full allegiance to the non-Muslim rulers and having won their favour, should freely proceed with their movement of disrupting and tearing apart the helpless fraternity of Islam". This was the brief formula as conceived by the

Mirza and which was later repeated numerous times in speeches and writings by the Mirza's successors and the leading writers and orators of his community.

The political design of the Qadianis was initially misunderstood even by the British. The Qadianis, however, by sustained efforts, convinced the Englishmen the 'potential' of their movement. The British were quick to grasp the reality and taking the Qadianis as the most loyal element among their Muslim subjects, they used this community as their tool not only in India but also in other Muslim countries.

Later, when the communal struggle between Hindus and the Muslims in India intensified, the nationalist leaders of the Congress also came to realise the 'potential' of the Qadianis. It was around the year 1930, that a prominent Hindu Leader entered into a long debate with the late Dr. Iqbal in support of Qadianism. Another famous Hindu leader openly declared :

"From our point of view, the Qadianis are the most desirable group among the Muslims. This is because their prophet is indigenous and their Holy places are situated in this country". In fact, in consistence with their peculiar creed, the political stance adopted by the Qadianis is viewed by the non-Muslims with anxiety and sadness. It has always been a common belief among the Muslims that the only group who can become a tool in

the hands of the enemies of Islam to subvert the Muslim community from within are the Qadianis. This belief has been strengthened by the fact that when Baghdad, Bait al-Muqdas and Constantinople fell into the hands of British during World War I the only faction from among the Muslims who rejoiced at this event and celebrated the occasion with illuminations were the Qadianis. As if this were not enough, the Qadiani Khalifa made an open declaration to the effect that 'our progress depends on the progress of the British Government'. Wherever the British Empire expands, it will open up new fields for our work of propagation. In view of the above, it cannot be assumed that the suspicions of the Muslims in regard to the Qadianis are unfounded.

Additional Causes of Acrimony

(6) The declaration of the Muslims as infidels, the practice of their social boycott and the economic friction caused by the Qadianis had engendered bitterness between them and the Muslims. The offensive and inflammable writings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers added to this bitterness. To illustrate the point, some extracts from their writings are cited below. The Court can form its own opinion as to how offensive these writings are for the majority of the Muslims :

"In an advertisement, entitled 'Revocation of an error', Hadrat Masih Mau'ud observed that the following words of the revealed verse, i.e.,

”مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ“

contain a reference to me. God has called me ‘Muhammad, the Apostle of God’.” (*Al-Fazal Newspaper*, Qadian Volume 2, No. 10, dated July 15, 1915).

“Hence the shadowy prophethood did not detract from the status of Masih Mau’ud (the promised Messiah). It rather elevated his dignity so much so that he stood equal to the Prophet of God”. (*Kalimatul Faal* by Sahibzada Bashir Ahmad Qadiani, printed in the *Journal Review of Religions*, page 113, No. 3, Volume 14).

“For him (the Holy Prophet) the emblem of the eclipsed Moon was revealed, and for me the emblem of both the eclipsed Moon and the eclipsed Sun was revealed. Would you refute me, still ?” (*Miracles of Ahmad*, page 71, by Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani).

“Muhammad has descended among us again ; His former glory has been even more enhanced. He who would see Muhammad, O Akmal, Should behold Ghulam Ahmad in Qadian”. (Verses by the poet Qazi Muhammad Zahur-ud-Din Akmal, Qadiani, printed in the *Newspaper Paigham-i-Sulah* Lahore, dated March 14, 1916).

“There is a world of difference between me and your Hussain, for I am the recipient of unfailing support and aid from Providence”. (*Nuzul-i-Masih*, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 96).

"I am the slain one of God whereas your Hussain was the slain one of the enemies. The difference, therefore, is clear and 'obvious'. *Nuzūl-i-Masīh*, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 81).

"Forget then the memory of Mary's Son ; Ghulam Ahmad is better than he". (*Dāst-ul Balā*, page 20).

"Jesus excelled in nothing except deception and fraud. It is a pity that the ignorant Christians believe such a person to be divine. And what a pure and noble family he came of : Three of his paternal grandmothers and three grandmothers on his maternal side were adulteresses and prostitutes and from their blood was born Jesus Christ". (Appendix to *Anjam Atham*, page 7, *Nur-ul-Quran*, volume 2, page 12).

"He who refuses to follow thee or does not owe allegiance to thee or remains thy enemy—that person is an enemy of God and his Prophet and hence shall be cast into Hell". *Itham*, revelation to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad *Tabligh-i-Risalat* (Propagation of Divine Ministry), volume 9, page 27).

"The entire body of Muslims have rendered allegiance to me and affirmed their faith in my divine ministry. It is only the offspring of prostitutes and debauches who refuse to believe in me". (*Aina-Kamalat*—"Mirror of Virtues", page 547).

"He who opposes me is a Christian, a Jew, a heretic, and a hellish person". (*Nazûl-i-Masîh*, page 4 ; *Tazkira*, Page 227; *Tuhfa Gol-ria*, page 31, *Tabligh-i-Risalat*, volume 9, page 27).

"Verily our enemies are swines of the wilderness and their women are worse than bitches". *Najmul Huda*, page 10, *Dur Samin*, page 294).

He who refuses to be convinced of our victory is evidently inclined to be called a bastard". (*Anwar al-Islam*, page 30).

Inevitable Consequence

(7) All these causes had been at work over the past half-century, and Qadianism has become an issue for the Muslims in the Punjab, which, though not a big one, yet was a very bitter issue in psychological terms. Hundreds of thousands of people in the cities and the villages were all enraged. Admittedly, the resentment not yet erupted into a major crisis before, but it had constantly caused family feuds and local quarrels over the past thirty or forty years and these disputes were often taken to civil and criminal courts. Apart from the upper strata of the Muslim Society, who probably remained aloof, the common public opinion among the lower middle class Muslims has always demanded that the Qadianis should be declared a minority separate and distinct from the rest of the Muslims, so that the Qadianis, posing as Muslims, may no longer enjoy the opportunity

of creating an subversion of the Muslim Society from within by their incessant missionary propaganda. Twenty years ago, the late Dr. Iqbal in his treatise, *Islam and Ahmadism*, had ably presented these sentiments of the Muslim community and had supported the Muslim demand with strong and convincing arguments.

(8) The Muslims knew that there were scant hopes of success in expelling the Qadianis from the fold of Islam so long as the British domination continued. It was naturally unreasonable to expect that a foreign nation would go so far as to take the trouble of understanding sympathetically and resolving a social problem which has arisen in the Muslim community. Besides, the Muslims were perfectly aware that it was in the interests of the British to keep the Qadianis with the pale of Islam, so that they could use the Qadianis as a tool to sabotage Muslim interests whenever the opportunity arose. When Pakistan came into being as a sovereign state, the Muslims rightly hoped on the national Government along with other problems, would solve the Qadiani issue as well, which had created permanent dissensions among the Muslim community for a period of fifty years and had divided the nation into two factions who were mutually hostile and locked in constant struggle over religious, social, economic and political differences. These expectations of the Muslims mounted with the passage of time, but later these hopes waned and dwindled gradually into frustration, unrest and grievances, During my tour through the

length and breadth of the Punjab in 1950 and 1951, from the cities, I also toured to the rural areas. In the entire course of my journey there was hardly a place where the people did not ask me question about Qadianism. I then realised that if the issue over which the people felt impelled to express such strong feelings was not solved, it would soon grow into a major crisis.

Provocation caused by the Qadianis

(9) After the establishment of Pakistan, the Qadianis made a series of provocative moves which added to the concern already felt by the Muslims. The Muslims felt that the Qadiani problem was assuming an even more dangerous shape than had been during the British period. Excluding minor matters, I move the court to take note of five important points :

In the first place, in the course of his address delivered at Quetta on July 22, 1948, Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud laid bare his plan of turning Baluchistan into a Qadiani province, so that it could serve as a base for the subsequent conquest of the whole of Pakistan. For the full text of this address, I refer to the issue of *Al-Fazl*, dated 13th August, 1948. The Mirza did not express this idea as only a passing thought, but later reiterated this design on several occasions. The fact proves that this is a permanent scheme on which the Mirza's mind has been long been contemplating.

In the second place, the Mirza has time and again openly declared his plan, according to which

the Qadianis should make determined and organised efforts to penetrate into the State Services in increasing numbers, and having thus taken hold of the Government machinery, they should wield all State Power to promote the ends of the Qadiani community. It would suffice to quote just one extract from an address by the Qadiani Spokesman in illustration of this point :

“If they (the provincial organizations of the Qadiani community) set their young men to the task of earning worldly gains, they should put them in those employments whereby the community can take advantage of their positions. In fierce competition all young men enter into a single department of State. There are several other departments which can prove useful for the community in securing its rights and protecting itself from mischief. So long as the community does not have its own young men working in these departments, the community cannot derive full benefits from them. For example, among the more important departments of State are the Army, the Police Force, Administrative Services, Railways, Finance, Accounts, Customs and Engineering. These are the eight or ten major departments through which our community can safeguard and preserve its rights. A large number of our young men rush into the Armed Forces. As a result our numerical proportion in the Defence

Forces is comparatively much higher than in other departments of State. The state of affairs is not conducive to our best advantage as regards the maintenance and protection of our rights. Other State Services also await our participation. You are certainly free to send your young men into employment, but why shouldn't they go into such departments, whereby the community may take advantage of their services? We should make a plan for this purpose and act according to it".

(*Al-Fazl*, January 11, 1952)

Thirdly, the Qadiani Vicegerent has always been trying to provoke and instigate his followers against the "enemy". He has always sought to foster an aggressive mentality among his people. As an example, look at the following extract from one of his addresses :

"Our people are upset by the opposition offered to them ; our people are annoyed at the enmity shown to them by others ; our people are vexed as to why they are persecuted. If they slander us and persecute us because they are our prey, we have no cause for worry. We should not feel concerned at all. On the contrary, we should rejoice that the "Enemy" knows that if we stir again we shall overwhelm the religion of the "Enemy".

(*Al-Fazl*, July 16, 1949)

It is clear that in the above passage 'our

people' refers to the Qadianis and the word "Enemy" denotes the Muslims. The Mirza rejoices over the fact that the Muslims look upon the Qadiani movement as a destructive challenge to their religion. Similar aggressive addresses can be found in the issues of *Al-Fazl* dated 5th July, 1950 and 7th May, 1951.

Fourthly, this aggressive stance of the Qadiani community has not only been expressed in warlike speeches, but it has been given a concrete and practical shape. The news of this development has caused widespread unrest among the Muslims. The establishment in the Army of a 'Furqan Battalion' which is exclusively composed of Qadiani personnel, the various armament factories owned and operated by the Qadianis and the large-scale grants of Arms Licenses to the members of the Qadiani community are some of the cases in point. The Qadianis themselves have widely publicised these in order to frighten the people.

Fifthly, Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood and other members of his community started issuing threats to the Muslims from the early days of 1952. The tenor of these threats became more and more provocative as the days passed. For example, look at their following statements :

"Victory shall be ours, you shall be arraigned before us like criminals, and you shall meet with the same fate as befell Abu Jehl and his party on the Day of the Victory of Mecca". (*Al-Fazl*, dated 3rd Jan. 1952)

"Do not let the year 1952 go out before you strike terror to the heart of the Enemy in order to make him realise that Ahmadism cannot be wiped out, and that there is no choice open to him except to fall into the lap of Ahmadi religion".

(*Al-Fazl*, 16th January, 1952)

"Yes, the time has come to avenge the death of the pious 'Ulama' who have been killed from the early days of the movement at the instigation of the bloody mullas.

The debt of blood must be repaid in full measure to :

1. 'Ata Ullah Shah Bukhari.
2. Mulla Badayuni.
3. Mulla Ihtisham-ul-Haq.
4. Mulla Muhammad Shafi.
5. Mulla Maududi (the fifth horseman)".

(*Al-Fazl*, 15th July, 1952)

These are the historical causes which progressively aggravated the dispute between the Muslims and the Qadianis.

ULAMA'S AMENDMENTS

TO

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES REPORT

In January 1953 thirty-three accredited Ulama of the various schools of thought amongst Muslims assembled in Karachi to consider the B.P.C. Report of Pakistan Constituent Assembly. Among other proposals and amendments, they proposed the following amendments regarding Qadianis :—

1. In this schedule, the figure 88 in the column 'seats reserved for Muslims' against Punjab should be substituted by 87 and a new column, 'seats reserved for Qadianis', should be added. In this new column, figure '1' should be inserted against Punjab.

The following should be added to the notes to this schedule :

- (1) "For occupying the seats of Qadianis in Punjab, Qadianis of other areas in Pakistan should also be entitled to vote and should be eligible for election".
- (2) "A Qadiani is a person who professes to believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian as his religious leader".

This is a very important amendment upon which we insist with all the emphasis at our command. It is by no manner proper for the constitution-makers of our country to be oblivious of the peculiar conditions obtaining in the country and the social problems of a peculiar nature confronting us and to frame a constitution on the basis of their personal views. They must not be unaware of how delicate and tense their situation has become in areas where a considerable number of Qadianis are living side by side with Muslims. They should not behave like our erstwhile rulers who did not care to take cognizance of the Hindu-Muslim problem until the whole of undivided India had become blood-stained on account of the Hindu-Muslim disturbances. For our constitution-makers, belonging to this country as they do, it would be a tragic blunder that they should refuse to realize the existence of a Qadiani-Muslim problem which needs an urgent solution until such time as they find that it has grown into an uncontrolled blaze. What has added considerably to the delicacy of the problem is, that while, on the one hand, Qadianis try to pose themselves as, and mix with, Muslims, on the other hand they stand, not only aloof from but as rivals against Muslims by virtue of their creed, religious practices and collective organization and openly dub all the Muslims as '*Kafirs*'. The remedy even today lies in declaring them a minority altogether separate from the Muslims as had been proposed by the late Allama Iqbal twenty years back.

2. Similarly the words 'and Qadianis' should be added at the end of Section I of the Report of Minorities Committee.

APPENDIX III

IQBAL ON QADIANISM

*Extracts from Speeches and Statements of
Dr. Muhammad Iqbal*

"Any religious society historically arising from the bosom of Islam, which claims a new prophethood for its basis, and declares all Muslims who do not recognize the truth of its alleged revelation as *kafirs*, must, therefore, be regarded by every Muslim as a serious danger to the solidarity of Islam. This must necessarily be so; since the integrity of Muslim Society is secured by the idea of the Finality of Prophethood alone". (p. 94).

"The intensity of feeling which the Indian Muslims have manifested in opposition to the Qadiani movement is, therefore, perfectly intelligible to the student of modern sociology. Average Muslim who was, the other day, described as 'Mulla-ridden' by a writer in the 'Civil & Military Gazette', is inspired in his opposition to the movement more by his instinct of self-preservation than by a fuller grasp of the meaning of the Idea of Finality in his faith. The so-called 'enlightened' Muslim has seldom made an attempt to understand the real cultural significance of the idea of Finality

of Prophethood in Islam, and a process of slow and imperceptible Westernization has further deprived him even of the instinct of self-preservation. Some of these so-called enlightened Muslims have gone to the extent of preaching 'tolerance' to their brethren-in-Faith. I can easily excuse Sir Herbert Emerson (Governor of the Punjab) for preaching toleration to Muslims ; for a modern European who is born and brought up in entirely a different culture does not, and perhaps cannot, develop the insight which makes it possible for one to understand an issue vital to the very structure of a community with an entirely different cultural outlook". (p. 96)

"The Government must seriously consider the present situation and try, if possible, to understand the mentality of the average Muslim in regard to this issue which he regards as absolutely vital to the integrity of his community. After all, if the integrity of a community is threatened, the only course open to that community is to defend itself against the forces of disintegration.

And what are the ways of self-defence ?

Controversial writings and refutations of the claims of the man who is regarded by the parent community as a religious adventurer. It is then fair to preach toleration to the parent community whose integrity is threatened and to allow the rebellious group to carry on its propaganda with impunity, even when the propaganda is highly abusive ?

If a group, rebellious from the point of view of the parent community, happens to be of some special service to the Government, the latter are at liberty to reward their services as best as they can. Other communities will not grudge it. But it is too much to expect that a community should calmly ignore the forces which tend seriously to affect its collective life. Collective life is as sensitive to the danger of dissolution as individual life.

There is one further point which demands Government's special consideration. The encouragement in India of religious adventurers on the ground of modern liberalism tends to make people more and more indifferent to religion and will eventually completely eliminate the important factor of religion from the life of Indian communities. The Indian mind will then seek some other substitute for religion, which is likely to be nothing less than the form of atheistic materialism which has appeared in Russia". (p. 98).

"The best course for the rulers of India is, in my opinion, to declare the Qadianis a separate community. This will be perfectly consistent with the policy of the Qadianis themselves and the Indian Muslim will tolerate them just as he tolerates the other religions". (p. 100).

It is hardly necessary to add in this connection that theological bickerings among Muslim sects do not affect vital principles on which all these sects agree despite levelling charges of heresy against each other.

A LETTER TO THE "STATESMAN"

(The "Statesman" published Dr. Iqbal's statement on "Qadianis and Orthodox Muslims" along with a criticism of it in the first leader. The following letter was in reply addressed to the "Statesman", and was published on June 10, 1935) :

"I am very thankful to you for your critical leader on my statement which was published in your issue of the 14th May. The question which you have raised in your leader is a very important one, and I am really very glad that you have raised it. I did not raise it in my statement because I felt that, considering the separatist policy of the Qadianis which they have consistently pursued in religious and social matters ever since the birth of the idea of building a new community on the foundations of a rival Prophethood and the intensity of the Muslim feeling against this move, it was rather the duty of the Government to take administrative cognizance of such a fundamental difference between the Qadianis and the Muslims without waiting for a formal representation on behalf of the Muslim community of India. I was encouraged in the feeling by the Government's attitude in the matter of the Sikh community which till 1919 was not administratively regarded as a separate political unit

but which was later treated as such without any formal representation on the part of the Sikhs, in spite of the Lahore High Court's finding that the 'Sikhs were Hindus'.

However, now that you have raised this question I should like to offer a few observations on a matter which I regard as of the highest importance both from the British and the Muslim points of view. You want me "to make it perfectly clear whether, when or where I can tolerate official cognizance of any one community's religious differences". Let me point out:—

First, that Islam is essentially a religious community with perfectly defined boundaries—belief in the Unity of God, belief in all the Prophets and belief in the Finality of Muhammad's Prophethood. The last mentioned belief is really the factor which accurately draws the line of demarcation between Muslims and non-Muslims and enables one to decide whether a certain individual or group is a part of community or not. For example, the Brahmos believe in God, they also regard Muhammad (on whom be peace) as one of the Prophets of God, yet they cannot be regarded as part of Islam because they, like the Qadianis, believe in the theory of perpetual revelation through Prophets and do not believe in the Finality of Prophethood in Muhammad. No Islamic sect, as far as I know, has ever ventured to reject this doctrine. The Bahais in Iran have openly rejected the Principle of Finality but have at the same time frankly admitted that they are a

new community and not Muslims in the technical sense of the word. According to our belief Islam as a religion was revealed by God, but the existence of Islam as a society of nation depends entirely on the personality of the Holy Prophet. In my opinion only two courses are open to the Qadianis, either frankly to follow the Bahais or to reject their interpretations of the idea of Finality in Islam and to accept the idea with all its implications. Their diplomatic interpretations are dictated merely by a desire to remain within the fold of Islam for obvious political advantages.

Secondly, we must not forget the Qadianis' own policy and their attitude towards the world of Islam. The founder of the movement described the parent community as "rotten milk", and his own followers as "fresh milk" warning the latter against mixing with the former. Further, their denial of fundamentals, their giving themselves a new name (Ahmadis) as a community, their non-participation in the congregational prayers of Islam, their social boycott of Muslims in the matter of matrimony, etc. and, above all, their declaration that the entire world of Islam is *Kafir*, all these constitute an unmistakable declaration of separation by the Qadianis themselves. Indeed, the facts mentioned above clearly show that they are far more distant from Islam than Sikhs from Hinduism for the Sikhs at least intermarry with the Hindus, even though they do not worship in the Hindu temples.

Thirdly, it does not require any special intelligence to see why the Qadianis, while pursuing a policy of separation in religious and social matters, are anxious to remain politically within the fold of Islam. Apart from the political advantages in the sphere of Government service which accrue to them by remaining within the fold of Islam, it is obvious that in view of their present population, which, according to the last census, is fifty-six thousand only, they are not entitled even to a single seat in any legislature of the country and cannot, therefore, be regarded as a political minority in the sense in which you seem to be using the expression. The fact that the Qadianis have not so far asked for separation as a distinct political unit shows that in their present position they do not find themselves entitled to any representation in legislative bodies. The new constitution is not without provisions for the protection of such minorities. To my mind, it is clear that in the matter of approaching the Government for separation the Qadianis will never take the initiative. The Muslim community is perfectly justified in demanding their immediate separation from the parent community. If the Government does not immediately agree to this demand, the Indian Muslims will be driven to the suspicion that the British Government is keeping the new religion in store, as it were, and delaying the separation, because in view of the small number of its adherents it is, for the present, incapable of functioning as a fourth community in

the province which may effectively damage the already marginal majority of Punjab Muslims in the local legislature. The Government did not wait for a formal representation for separation by the Sikhs in 1919 : Why should they wait for a formal representation by the Qadianis ?" (p. 107).

Reply to Questions raised by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru

"I am inclined to think that my statement on Qadianism—no more than a mere exposition of a religious doctrine on modern lines—has embarrassed both the Pandit and the Qadianis, perhaps because both inwardly resent, for different reasons, the prospects of Muslim political and religious solidarity, particularly in India. It is obvious that the Indian nationalist whose political idealism has practically killed his sense for fact, is intolerant of the birth of a desire for self-determination in the heart of North-West Indian Islam. He thinks, wrongly in my opinion, that the only way to Indian nationalism lies in a total suppression of the cultural entities of the country through the interaction of which alone India can evolve a rich and enduring culture. A nationalism achieved by such methods can mean nothing but mutual bitterness and even oppression. It is equally obvious that the Qadianis, too, feel nervous by the political awakening of the Indian Muslims, because they feel that the rise in political prestige of the Indian Muslims is sure to defeat their designs to carve out from the *Ummah* of the Arabian Prophet a new *Ummah* for the 'Indian prophet'. It is no small surprise to me that my effort to impress on the Indian Muslims the extreme necessity of internal cohesion in the present critical moment of their history in India, and my warning them against the forces of disintegration, masquerading

as reformist movements, should have given the Pandit an occasion to sympathize with such forces Similarly the Indian Muslims are right in regarding the Qadiani movement, which declares the entire world of Islam as *Kafir* and socially boycotts them, to be far more dangerous to the collective life of Islam in India than the metaphysics of Spinoza to the collective life of the Jews. The Indian Muslim, I believe, instinctively realizes the peculiar nature of the circumstances in which he is placed in India and is naturally much more sensitive to the forces of disintegration than the Muslims of any other country. This instinctive perception of the average Muslim, in my opinion, is absolutely correct and has, I have no doubt, a much deeper foundation in the conscience of Indian Islam. Those who talk of toleration in a matter like this are extremely careless in using the word "toleration" which, I fear, they do not understand at all. The spirit of toleration may arise from very different attitudes of the mind of man. As Gibbon would say: "There is the toleration of the philosopher to whom all religions are equally true; of the historian to whom all are equally false; and of the politician to whom all are equally useful. There is the toleration of the man who tolerates other modes of thought and behaviour because he has himself grown absolutely indifferent to all modes of thought and behaviour. There is the toleration of the weak man who, on account of sheer weakness, must pocket all kinds of insults heaped on things or persons that he holds

dear". It is obvious that these types of tolerance have no ethical value. On the other hand, they unmistakably reveal the spiritual impoverishment of the man who practises them. True toleration is begotten of intellectual breadth and spiritual expansion. It is the toleration of the spiritually powerful man who, while jealous of the frontiers of his own faith, can tolerate and even appreciate all forms of faith other than his own.....
The folly of our preachers of toleration consists in describing the attitude of the man who is jealous of the boundaries of his own faith as one of intolerance. They wrongly consider this attitude as a sign of moral inferiority. They do not understand that value of his attitude is essentially biological, where the members of a group feel, either instinctively or on the basis of rational argument, that the corporate life of the social organism to which they belong is in danger, their defensive attitude must be appraised in reference mainly to a biological criterion. Every thought or deed in this connection must be judged by the life value that it may possess. The question in this case is not whether the attitude of an individual or community towards the man who is declared to be a heretic is morally good or bad. The question is whether it is life-giving or life destroying.....

VERDICT OF JUDICIARY

Qadianis are Apostates i.e. outside the pale of Islam

On 24th July, 1926, Maulvi Ilahi Bux, a resident of village Mahanad, in the Tahsil of Ahmadpur Sharqia, Bahawalpur State, filed a suit, on behalf of his daughter, Ghulam Aisha, against Abdur Razzaq Qadiani, in the lower Court of Ahmadpur Sharqia. In the case it was alleged by the plaintiff that Abdur Razzaq to whom she was given in wedlock before her age of puberty, was no longer her lawful husband since, in consequence of his conversion to Qadiani faith, he had become renegade from Islam and that apostasy, in accordance with the Law of Shariat, renders a wedlock null and void.

The defendant stated in reply that the Qadianis are only a sect of Musalmans and that, on the basis of their articles of faith, they cannot be declared infidel (*Kafir*) or apostate (*murtad*). Hence there is no ground for dissolution of marriage.

This case, having passed through several stages, came up for hearing before Munshi Muhammad Akbar Khan, B.A., LL.B., District Judge, Bahawalnagar. The learned Judge, after several years'

full discussion, in which renowned scholars and divines of both the parties took part, gave his verdict on 7th February, 1935 which reads as follows :—

Judgement

On behalf of the plaintiff it has been proved that Mirza Sahib (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian) is a false claimant of prophethood and hence the defendant who accepts Mirza Sahib as Prophet shall also be deemed an apostate. Therefore the preliminary issues framed by the Munsif of Ahmadpur Sharqia on 4th November, 1926 having been established in favour of the plaintiff, it is hereby declared that the defendant by reason of his conversion to the Qadiani faith has become an apostate and therefore his marriage stands dissolved since the date of his apostasy.

Even if the articles of the defendant's faith are considered in the light of the foregoing discussions the plaintiff has successfully established vis-a-vis the allegation of the defendant, that there shall not arise an 'ummati' prophet after Muhammad (peace be on him). Besides this the other articles of faith, which the defendant has ascribed to himself may correspond to the general view of principles in Islamic faith, he shall be deemed to act on them in the sense and import which Mirza Sahib has put upon them. And because this is in conflict with the one which the Muslim *Ummah* as whole has attributed to them he cannot there-

fore be called a Muslim. And, in both the cases he is an apostate. And apostate's marriage stands dissolved by reason of his apostasy. It is, therefore, decreed in favour of the plaintiff that the plaintiff ceased to be the wife of the defendant from the date of the defendant's apostasy and that she will be entitled to the costs incurred in the case.

Extracts From
MAULANA SYED ABUL 'ALA MAUDUDI'S
SECOND STATEMENT
In The Court of Enquiry

Several questions have been raised in this court about the demands put forth by the Muslims concerning the Qadianis, i.e., that they should be declared a separate minority outside the pale of Islam ; that the Qadianis should be removed from key posts in the Government Departments—but correct and complete answers to these questions have not been furnished.

The Nature of Demands concerning the Qadianis is Political as well as Religious

(A) It has been repeatedly asked whether these demands are religious or they are political. The usual answer to this inquiry has been that these demands are mainly of a religious character. In point of fact, both the inquiry and its reply are fallacious. There is no doubt that the dispute which these demands attempt to resolve started on religious grounds. Nonetheless by its evolutionary development in the course of 50 years, it is no

longer merely a religious dispute, but has become a social, economic and political issue. Religious or moral, whatever the original basis of a problem might be, as soon as this problem starts generating complications and tensions in the daily life of the society, its solution inevitably calls for constitutional, legal or administrative measures. On such occasions, the debate as to the basis of this issue being moral or issue being sought to be resolved by political means is totally out of place and irrelevant. The religious dispute between the Muslims and the Qadianis means that a permanent, distinct and organised community has been formed within the body of Muslims, whose beliefs are fundamentally opposed to Islam. This community practises social boycott of the Muslims; it is arrayed against the Muslims on the economic front; it has been undermining the political cause of the Muslims, and despite all this, this community, posing as Muslim, carries on its proselytising activity among the Muslims and thus continues to add to its numerical strength. This state of affairs engenders an ever-growing process of internal disintegration of the Muslim Society. A further cause for serious concern to the Muslims is provided by the absorption of the vastly disproportionate number of the Qadianis in the State Services and the repeated declaration by the Qadianis of their political intents, notably their design of capturing Baluchistan and making it a base for the eventual conquest of the whole of Pakistan. How can a problem like

this be characterised as only a religious one? And what measures other than the constitutional, legal and administrative ones are open to us to resolve this problem? In united India, the issue between the Hindus and the Muslims was also mainly based on religion. But, all demands to resolve this issue, beginning with the demand for separate electorates to that for the division of the country, were demands of political nature.

Differences between the Muslims and the Qadianis are Basic and Fundamental

(B) Questions have been raised in this court which purport to treat the differences between the Muslims and the Qadianis as only another sectarian issue that has become the subject of recrimination among the '*Ulama*' and the Sects. But, all these questions are based on wrong assumptions, tending to be a confused discussion. The issue between the Muslims and the Qadianis cannot be taken as a mere sectarian dispute. There is no denying the fact that the '*Ulama*' of one sect have often accused the '*Ulama*' of another sect of heresy and have sometimes exceeded the permissible bounds in their *fatwas* (declaration of opinions). This state of affairs is, indeed, regrettable. But, at the same time, it is also an undeniable fact that the issues upon which the '*Ulama*' exchanged *fatwas* of heresy involved the interpretation of certain religious doctrines. In view of this, the Muslim Society did not regard these *fatwas* of heresy exchanged between the sectarian '*Ulama*' as worthy

of serious notice. The wise and scrupulous '*Ulama*' have always disapproved of these *fatwas*. Never before has the Muslim Society reached a consensus about declaring a person or a faction as outside the pale of Islam. Muslims owing allegiance to different sects have often joined in offering prayers. They have joined the funeral prayers of different sects. Inter-marriage is common. Examples of inter-marriage between the Shias and the Sunnis multiply to several thousands. Above all, the Muslims have always forged a united front in the face of every important national problem. The national interest has always remained common to all sects. They have always shared communal sentiments and political aspirations. In contrast to this, the Muslims and the Qadianis have always had basic differences. Any one who has but a scant knowledge of Islam cannot be ignorant of the fact that Prophethood is a fundamental article of faith in the religion to Islam and, hence, faith or disbelief in a person's claim to Prophethood necessarily splits the *Ummah* into two separate communities: the Believers and the Disbelievers. It was on the basis of this fundamental belief that a barrier between the supporters of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's claim to prophethood and those who rejected this claim. Such a barrier had never been raised between any two sects of Muslims in the History of Islam. The Muslims of all sects unanimously proclaimed the Qadianis as apostate and the Qadianis, on their part, declared all those who refuted the Mirza's claim to prophethood as heretics. The

fatwas of the 'Ulama accusing one another of apostasy had not rent asunder the unity of the Muslim society, but the declaration of the Qadianis as heretic by the Muslims and *vice versa* divided the people into two distinct communities. The difference between the two communities ran over every thing, from worship to the way of living. Their national interests and political ambitions became far apart. Gradually these differences developed into active hostility and strife against each other. How can one lose sight of this obvious dichotomy between the Muslims and the Qadianis and how can this division between the two communities be mixed up with sectarian differences among the Muslim community? Is this justified or even tenable? In any case, even if it is ruled by the court that the differences between the Qadianis and the Muslim are only sectarian in character, is it likely that the daily strife raging between the two communities, from the cities to the villages, among thousands of families and among thousands of individuals in offices and market centres will cease?

Demand for Declaring all Dissenters a Minority is not Imperative

(C) Another point repeatedly raised in the court relates to the question whether a similar demand shall be put forth for declaring all those who adopt an opinion different from the general body of the Muslims with regard to the basic issues of Islam, such as the 'Ahl-i-Qur'an' and the others as a non-Muslim minority. This question can be an-

answered in two ways : firstly, on the basis of religious canon and, secondly, from the practical point of view. Islam allows maximum scope for a divergence of opinion as regards interpretation, judgement and deduction. In the exercise of these faculties, a grave blunder may be misleading, nonetheless, it cannot be ruled that a man who commits a grave blunder in such matters is an apostate from Islam. On the contrary, whenever the fundamental belief of Islam are altered and the canons of Islam do not admit of such changes, the ruling must be that those who are responsible for these changes are outside the pale of Islam, and this ruling must be given without any consideration as to which party is affected. From the practical point of view, the answer to the above question lies in this that heresy committed by an individual or a number of scattered individuals is one thing, but the act of setting up within the Muslim Society of an organised renegade community, constantly engaged in increasing its numerical strength by propagation and at loggerheads with the Muslims in the economic and political spheres, is a totally different matter. Smitten for fifty years by the heresy of this well-organised community, and bearing it no longer, the Muslims have now put forth certain demands. Why, then, are the instances of the individual acts of heresy being recalled at this juncture ? Is it not virtually apparent to the whole world that the collective attitude of Muslims towards the individual acts of apostasy is

entirely different from the attitude adopted by them towards a community of heretics ? After all, when did the Muslims ever raise the demand for grouping all individual heretics into non-Muslim minorities ?

Causes for the Demand for Zafrullah Khan's Removal from Office.

(D) The demand for Sir Zafrullah Khan's removal from office not only originates from the doctrine that no non-Muslim should hold the office of a Minister in an Islamic State, but is also based on the fact that Sir Zafrullah Khan had always misused his official position to promote and strengthen the Qadiani movement before the Partition of India and after the establishment of Pakistan he has been even more actively engaged in taking undue advantage of his position as State Minister to promote the interests of Qadianism. His official position is, therefore, a permanent cause of complaint for the Muslims. We are told that but for the position of Zafrullah Khan in the State Cabinet, America would not have given Pakistan a grain of wheat. I say if it is really so, the matter becomes even more serious. This clearly implies that an American agent presides over our Foreign Affairs Department and our foreign policy has been pawned for ten lakh tons of grain. Under this circumstance, we must rather press for the removal of Zafrullah Khan from office than make the Qadiani Movement the basis of our demand, in order to break the shackles of political slavery to America. My statement, of course, is based on the supposition

that the American Government has clearly or impliedly communicated to the Government of Pakistan that the delivery of wheat is tied to the condition of Zafarullah Khan's stay in office. But, it is difficult for me to believe that any statesman in the American Government is foolish enough to prefer the friendship of a single individual to the goodwill of a nation of seventy and a half million people. Further, it is truly surprising that any American statesman would want to antagonize the sentiments of the people of Pakistan towards his Government rather than winning thanks from them for the friendly gift of the value of 48 crore rupees.

What are the Keyposts ? Arguments for the Removal of the Qadani from the Keyposts

(E) The demand for the removal of the Qadani from the keyposts is not only based on the doctrine that the appointment of non-Muslims to the keyposts in an Islamic State is inadmissible, but this demand is also being made on the following grounds : (1) In the past, under the patronage of the British, and in the present, due to the indifference and negligence of the rulers of Pakistan, this community has captured posts in Government service whose number is quite out of proportion to its small population ; (2) Any member of this community who has risen to a keypost has tried every means in his power to recruit a maximum number of his co-religionists in the State Services ; (3) The leader of this community, Mirza Bashir-ud-Din

Mahmood Ahmad, has openly urged his followers that they should try to infiltrate into all Government departments under an organized plan ; (4) Such members of this community as hold influential position have too often used posts under their direct authority as a bait for converting the candidates to the Qadiani religion ; (5) The aspirations of the Qadianis have risen to such heights that they dream of taking the entire machinery of the Government of Pakistan into their own hands.

Under these circumstances, we have been forced to the conclusion that the Qadianis should be removed from the keyposts of the Government. The word 'keypost', in the context of this demand, does not bear the same meaning as it has in the Muslim doctrine that the appointment of non-Muslims to the keyposts in an Islamic State is inadmissible. In the context of our demand, the word 'keypost' comprehends all the important posts the power of which may be misused by any Qadiani incumbent in the aforesaid manner. To say the truth, the conduct of this community has created a situation in which every right-minded person would feel the above demand falls far short of what is really essential. Actually there should have been an auxiliary demand for excluding the Qadianis from all Government Services for the next ten years, in order to correct the present state of imbalance.

Position taken by the Qadianis in their Statement to the Court is Fabricated

(2) An opinion has been expressed in this Court

that after the submission of a statement by the counsel for the President, Anjuman-i-Ahmadiya, Rabwah, setting out answers to the seven questions framed by the court, the differences between the Qadianis and the Muslims stand resolved. I have gone through this statement carefully. It is my considered opinion that this statement does not alter the existing position even to the slightest degree. Despite this statement, the causes which lie at the root of dispute and differences and which have so far embittered the relations between the two communities are unaffected. In this statement, the Qadianis have made a clever attempt to hide their real position behind the deception of crooked explanations with a two-fold purpose. Firstly, they have tried to deceive the court, in that it should think well of them and return suitable findings in their favour. Secondly, this statement enables them to continue their former course openly and without restraint. Any one who has some knowledge of their former writings and of the practices they have followed so far cannot fail to realize that in this statement the Qadianis have shifted their stand closer to the position held by the Lahori Ahmadis. The Qadianis do not affect this 'change' by explicitly stating that they are altering their beliefs and practices in order to resolve the conflict with the Muslims. They rather give the impression that their position has from the beginning invariably been the same. This, nevertheless, is a grave

mis-statement. It clearly implies that instead of changing their former standpoint, they are, in fact, reaffirming it and intend to adhere to it in the future. However, during the course of this enquiry, they have adopted temporarily a deceptive position and their standpoint is bound to change once the process of enquiry is over. The veil of their deception will be torn to shreds if we examine their statement in some detail.

(A) The court had enquired, "What is the status of the Muslims who refuse to believe in the alleged prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad? Are they pious and faithful Muslims? In answer to this question, the Qadianis state:

"No person can be called a non-Muslim on the ground of his disbelief in the prophethood of the Founder of the Ahmadiya Community".

Having said this, the Qadianis recollect all their former writings which contradict this statement. Hence they offer the following interpretation:

"It is possible that someone may attempt to create misunderstanding with reference to our former writings. We wish to make it clear in this regard that the terminology used in our past writings is exclusively meant for us. Common expressions which are current among the Muslims have been avoided. Since books dealing with this point are not addressed to the non-Ahmadis, but are directed to a certain section of our community, it was not felt

necessary to keep in mind and use the terminology in vogue among other Muslims”.

The above text makes it abundantly clear that the Qadianis are reaffirming rather than renouncing their former writings. And yet they wish the court to believe that the meaning of their former writings does not contradict their present statement! Let us now see only two extracts from their past writings :

“All Muslims who have not taken the oath of allegiance to Hadrat Masih Mau‘ud (the Promised Messiah), irrespective of the fact that they may not have heard the name of Hadrat Masih Mau‘ud, are infidels and outside the pale of Islam”. *Aina-i-Sadaqat by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, p. 35.*

“Any one who believes in Moses but refutes Mubammad or believes in Muhammad but refutes Masih Mau‘ud (the Promised Messiah) is not only a heretic but a confirmed infidel and outside the pale of Islam”. *Kalima-tul-Fazal by Sahibzada Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Sahib, p. 110.*

It is manifestly clear that in both these texts Muslims have been declared heretics, confirmed infidels and outside the pale of Islam only because they do not owe allegiance to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Would any one believe that these three terms formed part of the exclusive language of

the Qadianis and that their meaning was different from that current among Muslims? What an ugly attempt it is to explain away these writings by offering the plea that these writings were directed to a certain section (i.e., Lahori Ahmadis) of the Ahmadiya Community! After all, is it a secret for any one that the point on which the Lahori Qadiani dispute has been banned for the last 35 years was no other than that the Qadianis regarded all those Muslims who refuted the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as infidels and outside the pale of Islam, whereas the Lahori Ahmadis contradict this belief. If the two opposing factions did not mean by 'infidel' and 'outside the pale of Islam' that which is commonly understood by the Muslims, what, then, were the grounds of the dispute?

(B) In its second question, the court demanded to know: "Is the person who disbelieves in the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad an infidel?" The counsel for the President, Anjuman-i-Ahmadiya, Rabwah, furnishes the following answer to this question:

"The word 'Kafir' in the Arabic language means 'the disbeliever'. Hence, any one who disbelieves will be called a 'Kafir' in the Arabic speech. It is evident that as long as a person continues to disbelieve in a certain thing, he shall be considered a 'Kafir' (Infidel)".

In this statement, an impression has been given to the court that those who refute the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are called 'Kafirs' in the

literal sense of the word and that they do not use this word in its technical sense, as it is used in Islam. But this is a vivid deception. The two extracts from the writings of Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood and Sahibzada Bashir Ahmad cited above interpret the word 'Kafir' as 'one who is outside the pale of Islam'. The word has been further explained in the following texts written by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood and Sahibzada Bashir Ahmad :

"It is obligatory on us to look upon the non-Ahmadis as non-Muslims and hence we should not say prayers behind them. In our eyes they are the deniers of a prophet".

(Anwar-i-Khilafat, page 90).

"Now when it is quite clear that no person can attain salvation and divine forgiveness without having faith in the mission of the 'Masih Mau'ud, (the Promised Messiah), why do they make futile attempts to prove that the non-Ahmadis are also Muslims?"

(Kalima-tul-Fazal, page 148).

In the face of such writings, how can one be expected to believe that the Qadianis call the deniers of the Mirza's prophethood 'Kafirs' in the literal sense of 'non-believers'? The following statement contains an even greater deception :

"In our view disbelief in the mission of a divinely appointed prophet after Muhammad (peace be upon him) does not mean that these

non-believers in God and His Messenger are outcasts from the fraternity of Muhammad or that they have been expelled from the Muslim Society".

The italicised words in this extract have been cleverly used, indeed ! They do not deny that Muslims are outside the pale of Islam ; the words merely affirm that Muslims belong to the fraternity of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). Obviously enough, a man who affirms faith in Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), but denies the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, cannot be regarded as an outcast from the 'Fraternity of Muhammad'. It is the same as saying that a man who believes in the prophethood of 'Isa but denies Moses will remain a follower of 'Isa, and a man who affirms faith in the Prophetic Mission of Moses but denies 'Isa will yet be counted among the adherents of Moses. Nevertheless, none of the above persons will be regarded as a member of the Community of Islam. Similarly, the Qadianis do regard the deniers of the prophetic claim of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as members of the fraternity of Muhammad, for such people do not disbelieve in the Prophetic Mission of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) ; but they look upon all persons who deny the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as being outside the pale of Islam, on the ground that disbelief even in one of the Messengers of God renders a man liable to expulsion from Islam, and,

in the Qadianis' view, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is a divinely appointed Messenger. In the second sentence they do not state that the non-Ahmadi Muslims are not outside the pale of Islam; they rather condescendingly declare that the non-Ahmadi Muslims have not been expelled from the 'Muslim Society'. Clearly, the Qadianis hold no absolute sway over the Muslim Society and they cannot possibly expel any one from it.

(C) The third question framed by the court was "What is the dispensation for such infidels in the world and the Hereafter?" The counsel for the President, Anjuman-i-Ahmadiya, Rabwah, has submitted the following statement in answer to this question:

"There is no penalty for this type of Infidel in this world. He enjoys the same rights as Muslims in an Islamic State. Similarly, in social matters he shares the same rights with Muslims, except that in a genuine Islamic State he is debarred from holding the office of the Head of State. As regards the dispensation in the Hereafter, only God knows of it".

Here again the court has been supplied with misleading information regarding the real position of the Qadianis. The worldly dispensation for the kind of heresy the Muslims are charged with by the Qadianis is, in the words of Sahibzada Bashir Ahmad, as follows:

"Hadrat Masih Man'ud has permitted as lawful only such dealings between the Ahmadis

and the Muslims as were declared permissible by Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) between his followers and the Christians. We were enjoined upon to hold separate congregations for prayers. It was declared unlawful for us to give our daughters in marriage to them. What else is common between them and us? There are two types of relationship; religious and worldly. The chief factor in the religious relationship is joint participation in prayers and matrimony is the main link in worldly intercourse. Both these relationships are forbidden to us. If you enquire, "Are we permitted to take their daughters in marriage?" I say, "The daughters of the Christians are also permitted to us". And if you enquire, "Why do we greet the non-Ahmadijs with the words 'Peace be on you'?", the answer is that on certain occasions the Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) reciprocated the greetings of even the Jews with 'Peace be on you' and this fact is confirmed by the Traditions". (*Kalima-tul-Fazal*, page 169).

Turning to the dispensation that awaits these infidels in the Hereafter, it is, according to the 'Divine Message Revealed' to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, as follows :

"He who does not follow thee and does not render allegiance to thee and remains thy

opponent, he is the veritable foe of God and His Messenger, and shall be consigned to Hell". (*Tabligh-i-Risalat*, vol. IX, page 27).

No one will deny that in the eyes of the Qadianis the Divine Message revealed to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad far outweighs the statement submitted under the expediency of this enquiry by Sheikh Bashir Ahmad, advocate, in his capacity as counsel for the President, Anjuman-i-Ahmadiya, Rabwah. Moreover, the interpretation of the Mirza's doctrines as given by one of his leading followers is in any case more creditable and authentic than the explanation offered by the legal attorney of the Qadianis.

(D) The third question framed by the court was as follows: "Did the Mirza receive divine messages like the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and did he receive them in the similar manner?" In answer to this question, the Qadianis affirm that the Mirza received divine revelations. Along with this, they state that this divine revelation was inferior in dignity to that which was received by the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). But, this is not a correct answer to the question framed by the court. The point which has been carefully concealed is that according to the Qadiani belief the 'Revelations' transmitted to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad were of a nature similar to that of the Divine Messages received by the Holy Prophet

(peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). And with the Qadianis, the status of one who denounces this belief is the same as that of a person who refutes the Holy Qur'an. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself has stressed this point in the following verses :

آنچه من بشنوم زوحی خدا	بخدا پاک دانش زخطا
همچو قرآن منزله اش دانم	از خطایا همین ست ایمانم
بخدا هست این کلام مجید	از دہان خدائے پاک و وحید
آن یقینے کہ بود عیسیٰ را	بر کلامے کہ شد بروالفا
و ان یقین کلیم ہر تورات	و ان یقین ہائے سید السادات

کم نیم زان ہمہ بروئے یقین
ہر کہ گوید دروغ ہست لعین

(درائیں صفحہ ۲۸۷، مجموعہ کلام مرزا غلام احمد نزول مسیح صفحہ ۹۹)

(E) The court had framed the question : "Does the Ahmadi Religion contain any injunction against saying funeral prayers for those who deny the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad ?" In answer to this question, the Qadianis admit that 'Until now it has been the collective decision of the whole Ahmadi community not to say funeral prayers for a person who does not belong to our community'. Further on in this statement we are informed that a written injunction by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has now been found in which he says, "There is no harm in saying funeral prayers for a person who does not *refute the prophethood of the founder of the Ahmadiya community and has not*

thus rendered himself an infidel". If we consider the italicized words well, we shall clearly understand that this does not in the least alter their former position. It is obvious that the Mirza claims himself to be a prophet. A person can adopt only two attitudes in respect of one who claims the status of prophethood : either to accept or to refute his claim as such. There is no third alternative. Hence a person who refutes Mirza Ghulam Ahmad may not be an infidel, but he cannot escape the charge of infidelity. In this way, the virtual position of the Qadianis with regard to saying funeral prayers for the non-Ahmadi Muslims remains the same as before. It should be thoroughly understood that the word 'Mukadhdhib' (one who refutes or gives a lie) is not necessarily used for a person who literally calls a claimant to the status of prophethood a liar ; the refutation of a prophet is also tantamount to giving a lie to his claim.

(F) The court had framed the question : "Is marriage between an Ahmadi and a non-Ahmadi lawful ? Is there any injunction against such a marriage ?" In answer to this question, the counsel for the Ahmadis states, "Marriage between an Ahmadi male and a non-Ahmadi female is not forbidden. However, the marriage of an Ahmadi female to a non-Ahmadi male is firmly discouraged". Further, "The basis for this prohibition was to save the Ahmadi girls from the evil influence of those who nursed feelings of enmity against

Ahmadism", and proceeding on, it is averred that, "If an Ahmadi gives his daughter in marriage to a non-Ahmadi, the matrimonial tie is not proclaimed void". This answer does not present the true picture of the Qadiani position before the court. The real viewpoint of the Qadianis has been explained by Sahibzada Bashir Ahmad in *Kalimatul-Fazal*, in these words :

"Hadrat Masih Mau'ud (the Promised Messiah) holds lawful only that kind of intercourse with non-Ahmadis which the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) permitted between Muslims and Christians. Our prayers were held separate from the non-Ahmadis. It was declared unlawful to give our daughters in marriage to the non-Ahmadis. We were forbidden to say funeral prayers for them.....If you enquire, "Are we permitted to take their daughters in marriage?" my answer is, "We are permitted to take the daughters of the Christians also". (p. 169).

(G) In his statement, the counsel for the President, Anjuman-i-Ahmadiya, Rabwah, has also endeavoured to convince the court that the conduct of the Qadianis inasmuch as they have declared the Muslims infidels and have practised segregation in the matters of worship and social intercourse is not different from the conduct of various reformers, both ancient and modern, who have criticised the Muslim society and that of the 'Ulama' who have

been issuing *fatwas* (verdicts) of apostasy. It must be borne in mind that in principle there is a great deal of difference between the two. The objective of critical commentaries or writings upon the religious or moral state of the Muslim Society by past or present reformers is not to proclaim the entire body of the Muslims as heretics. Their purpose is to win over the people to the general spirit of Islam. They do not try to impose an entirely new doctrine. On the other hand, they urge them to follow the established canons and tenets of Islam which are universally acknowledged by the Muslims. Similarly, the verdicts of apostasy passed by the sectarian '*Ulama*' against each other for the most part originated in the belief of one scholar that the followers of other sects were alienated from the basic principles of Islam and *vice versa*. Never did a scholar make any verdict of Heresy against any sect on the ground that that sect had refused to accept a new doctrine enunciated by him. In contrast with this, the Qadianis proclaim the non-Ahmadi Muslims as infidels and practise segregation from them in worship and social intercourse on the ground that they do not accept the claim of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to be a prophet. There is no doubt that this claim to prophethood is an entirely new doctrine which is radically incompatible with the fundamental beliefs of a Muslim regarding the concept of prophethood. This difference arising out of principles is over and above the virtual

distinction that no other proclamation of apostasy save that of the Qadianis against the non-Ahmadi Muslims has separated the Qadianis from the Brotherhood of Islam in the matters of worship, matrimony, economic interest and political aims and aspirations and has brought this sect into direct conflict with the majority of Muslims in almost all walks of life.

Aggressive Posture adopted by the Qadianis is not Incidental

(3) The question has been raised in this court that, "Will the demand for proclaiming the Qadianis as a separate minority be pressed, if the Qadianis renounce their aggressive posture and give up their efforts to establish a state within the State?" The answer to this question lies in this: Whatever the Qadianis have done up to now is not incidental. Their actions have been an inevitable and natural consequence of their bid to create a separate *Ummat* within the *Ummat*. The natural tendency of every claim to prophethood is to bring into being a new and permanent *Ummat* and then to split it apart from all those who deny the claim. If this new *Ummat* cuts itself off from the other in a straight-forward manner, the peculiar tension and state of conflict which exist between the Qadianis and the Muslims, may be avoided. But, if the followers of a new prophet wish to live as an *Ummat* within the *Ummat*, a conflict between the two is inevitable. Under this circumstance the process of the religious conflict turning into a

social issue and progressing to become an economic and political struggle cannot be denied. Hence it is futile to offer an opinion on the basis of hypothetical suppositions—an opinion which will not have validity in the currents of daily life. The circumstance of the Qadianis remaining a part of the Muslim Society is based on one condition only and that is that the Qadianis should renounce their faith in the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. If they cannot perform this repudiation, they should form a separate *Ummat* and live apart from the Muslims, and our constitution and laws must reflect this factual position.

Heresy, Verdict of Apostasy and Expulsion from the Fold of Islam

(4) Some basic questions relating to Heresy and Verdict of Apostasy have also been touched upon in the course of proceedings in this court, but no clear and satisfactory answers to these have been provided. In this connection, some points must be clarified and brought to the notice of the court :

- (A) 'Heresy' and 'Expulsion from the fold of Islam' are not concurrent terms in all cases and under every circumstance. Heresy which renders a man liable to expulsion from the pale of Islam is (1) Refutation of those fundamental articles of the Islamic Faith in which belief is made obligatory or (2) Speech or action which is

tantamount to refuting these obligatory articles of the Faith, such as prostration before an idol, or reviling the name of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), or the wilful contempt of the Holy Qur'an, or the refusal to carry out any one of the established commandments of the Lord or of His Apostle (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), or (3) To make additions to or suppress or introduce alterations in the articles of the Faith in such a way as to distort basically that article of the Faith: for instance, combining faith in One God with the worship of idols or to include the name of one who is not a prophet in the roll of the Prophets or to believe in the teachings of such a man as the revealed truth from God.

- (B) Barring heresy as detailed above, there are many other acts of apostasy or hypocrisy, or of moral behaviour and thoughts for which the word 'Kufr' (Heresy) has been used in the Qur'an and the *Hadith* (the Traditions), or it has been said that the people who are guilty of these transgressions are not faithful and pious or else synonyms of rejection of Faith have been used with reference to these people. For example, omission to perform *Haj* despite having means is called 'Heresy' (*Kufr*) in the Qur'an. Renunciation of *Namaz* (Prayer) is regarded as 'Kufr' in *Hadith*. The shirkers from *Jihad* (Holy War) are adjudged as the

hypocrites by both the Qur'an and the *Hadith*. A person who is guilty of a breach of promise or misappropriation of a trust is clearly referred to in the *Hadith* as 'one who has neither religion nor faith'. Failing to comprehend the real import of these verses of the Qur'an or of the Traditions, some sects (for example, the Mutazilah and the Khawarij) and some other indiscreet persons proclaimed any one who measured up to these observations of God and the Holy Apostle (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) as outside the pale of Islam. Neither the context of the Qur'an and the *Hadith* reveals that this particular type of Heresy renders a man liable to expulsion from the pale of Islam nor is there any evidence on record from the period of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) or his Companions (Allah be pleased with them) to show that persons found guilty of such types of heresy were expelled from the fold of Islam. It is because of this reason that discreet scholars have always differentiated between this type of Heresy and Hypocrisy and that Heresy which renders a man liable to expulsion from the pale of Islam. These scholars have positively disapproved of treating the two kinds of Heresies at par. On certain occasions, if the Reformers of the Muslim Society have pronounced some persons possessing heretic traits as infidels, they have

done so to deter such people and call them back to their duty towards Islam. The Reformers have never dubbed any one as an apostate with the purpose of throwing him out of the fold of Islam.

- (C) If by speech or action a man is guilty of something which is synonymous with clear infidelity, a verdict of Heresy against him must be preceded by the following steps : (1) The person concerned should be asked to explain the real meaning of his action or speech. (2) A comprehensive review should be made of all his acts and speeches, so as to ascertain which meaning of his culpable act or speech represents the over-all viewpoint and action of this man. (3) If the act or speech of this man is capable of bearing two alternative interpretations, good or bad, good should be preferred ; save, of course, when there are sound reasons for preferring the bad interpretation. There is no doubt that a large number of the '*Ulama*' have issued verdicts of Heresy at random without observing the necessary restraints, but these ill-considered verdicts have never resulted in the virtual expulsion of the affected person from the pale of Islam. Not only did the rival schools of '*Ulama*' cancel out these proclamations of heresy with cogent arguments, but also the public opinion among the Muslims never really accepted the validity of such proclamations.

History presents but a few examples of Muslim consensus on expelling a sect from the fold of Islam. In every case, the consensus on expulsion was arrived at only when an act of clear infidelity was committed and it was found that the situation could admit of no alternative interpretation : for instance, in the case of the Nasseerites, who pronounced that Hadrat 'Ali (Allah be pleased with him) was God : or in the case of the Yazidi sect, who believed that a prophet would come after the Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and on the advent of this later prophet, the Law of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) would be abrogated ; or in the case of the Maimonia sect, who refused to believe that *Surah Yusef* formed part of the Qur'an. To these few examples has now been added the case of the Qadiani group concerning whom all the 'Ulama' of Islam and the general body of the Muslims have arrived at a consensus that they should be proclaimed Heretics and that this finding of Heresy against them includes also their expulsion from the pale of Islam. In the presence of the Qadiani religion, we cannot live with them as one nation and still be Muslims and Believers. If their 'Prophet' is true, we are infidels. If he is an impostor, they are infidels.

(D) It is beyond doubt that according to a

Tradition of the Prophet, if a person pronounces the other man as an infidel, whereas the man is not really an apostate, the charge of infidelity will rebound to the accuser. But, this certainly does not imply that if a person pronounces me as an infidel, I should retaliate by proclaiming him a heretic. This inference can neither be drawn from the *Hadith*, nor could it have been the design of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) to give a handle to the quarrelsome people to hurl charges of Heresy on each other. The real import of the Tradition is that a person should take extra heed in issuing a verdict of Heresy lest the person charged with heresy may not, in fact, be an infidel and God may punish the impostor instead for spreading Heresy among people.

EXTRACTS FROM
Maulana Syed Abul A'la Maududi's
Third Statement

IN THE COURT OF ENQUIRY

(Various stages through which the Movement launched by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad passed; various claims put forth by the Mirza during these stages and the impact of these claims on the Qadiani Beliefs and Conducts).

In the year 1880, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad appeared among the Muslims as a preacher and champion of Islam. Before we describe various beliefs and ideas propounded by the Mirza during the various periods of his life from 1880 to the year of his death (26 May, 1908) it is necessary to arrange these periods in chronological order, so that the beliefs and ideas relating to one period may be easily distinguished from those of the other period.

Chronological Order

(1) From 1880 to 1888—In this period, the Mirza was a preacher of Islam and a champion of the Faith who defended the religion of Islam from

the attacks of the non-Muslims. The Mirza insisted that his beliefs in regard to all matters were the same as the beliefs held by the general body of the Muslims. Although the Muslims were startled even then by various claims latent in his writings, yet the Mirza always managed to pacify the Muslim sentiment by offering various interpretations for his claims.

(2) In December, 1888 A.D., he published an advertisement inviting people to render allegiance to him. In 1889 A.D., he started receiving oaths of allegiance. At that time, he claimed himself to be only a 'Mujaddid-i-Waqt' (Renovator of the Age) and one 'Appointed by God'. He set up a comparison between himself and Masih (peace be upon him) on the ground that as Masih lived in poverty and humility, so was the Mirza carrying out his task in a state of destitution. In those days, the Muslims thought of the Mirza in favourable terms. However, they felt uneasy about the Mirza's claim that he was superior to all the venerable saints of Islam. (*Seerat-ul-Mehdi* by Sahibzada Bashir Ahmad Part I, pages 14, 31, 81; *Tubligh-i-Risalat*, volume I, pages 11, 12, 15).

(3) In 1891, the Mirza pronounced that Masih (peace be upon him) was dead, and he put forth his own claim to be the Promised Messiah and the Promised Mehdi. This caused great unrest among the Muslims. (*Seerat-ul-Mehdi*, page 31 and 89). In the early part of this period, the Mirza wrote: "For about twelve years, which is a long period

of time, I remained completely unaware that God had appointed me the Promised Messiah in the *Burahin* (i.e. *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*) with great emphasis. I had adhered to the traditional belief in the second coming of Christ (peace be upon him). After the passage of twelve years, the time came for the truth to be revealed to me. A continuous chain of revelations descended on me proclaiming that I was the Promised Messiah". (*Ijaz-i-Ahmadi*, Appendix to *Nazul-i-Masih*, page 7). The Mirza wrote in another place: 'Although in the *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*, God has named me 'Isa, and had affirmed that He and His Apostle (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) had foretold my advent, yet since a group of Muslims held steadfast to the belief which I also shared with them that Hadrat 'Isa (peace be upon him) would descend from heaven, so I did not wish to contradict the obvious meaning of the Quran and the *Hadith*. I gave a different interpretation to this revelation and continued to share the belief held by the general body of the Muslims and published it in *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*. Subsequently, however, revelations descended on me like a torrent proclaiming that I was the Messiah whose advent had been promised". *Haqiqat-ul-Wahi*, page 149).

(4) In 1900, some leading disciples of the Mirza started proclaiming him a prophet in unambiguous terms. They raised him to that status which, according to the Holy Qur'an, is reserved only for the Prophets (peace be upon them). Sometimes, the Mirza affirmed their statements; at other times,

he would interpret these statements by calling himself an incomplete prophet, a partial prophet, or a innovator merely to win over those who showed some hesitation in reposing their faith in his claim to prophethood. During the same period, Maulvi 'Abdul Karim, a leading disciple of the Mirza, delivered a sermon to the Friday congregation on 7th August, 1900. The Mirza himself was present at that congregation. In the course of his sermon, Maulvi 'Abdul Karim exhorted the Ahmadis: "If you do not follow the lead of the Masih Mau'ud (Promised Messiah) in all matters and if you do not affirm faith in him even as the companions believed in the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), then you shall stand guilty of discriminating among God's Prophets just as the non-Ahmadis do". At the conclusion of Friday Prayers, the Mirza affirmed the above statement in the following words: You have given a faithful description of my religion". (*Kalimat-ul-Fasl*, Sahibzada Bashir Ahmad, page 167). Yet, in spite of this affirmation, the Mirza abstained from putting forth in clear terms his claim to prophethood. According to Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood Ahmad, the Mirza's creed in those days was that "He was partly superior to Hadrat Masih (peace be upon him) and that he claimed to be a kind of 'Prophet in part' and his prophethood was imperfect". (*Al-Qaul-ul-Fasl*, page 24. For a further detailed clarification please refer to *Munkarin-i-Khilafat Ka Anjam* by Jalal-ud-Din Shams, page 19).

(5) In 1901, the Mirza, openly and unreservedly claimed himself to be a prophet and a messenger. He ceased qualifying his 'prophethood' with expressions like 'incomplete prophethood', 'prophet in part', or an 'innovator prophet' etc., in most of his writings. (*Seerat-ul-Mehdi*, part I, page 31). Jalal-ud-Din Shams, in his book, *Munkarin-i-Khilafat Ka Anjam* explains: "In some of his writings before the year 1901, the venerable Hadrat (i.e., the Mirza) denied his prophethood and said that he was not a prophet but an innovator. But, in his writings after the year 1901, he did not call his 'prophethood in part', nor did he style himself an 'Innovator'. Instead, in his writings, he always referred to himself as a 'prophet' in positive terms". (Page 19) In this same connection, Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood Ahmad states: "He effected a change in his creed in 1901. The year 1900 should be regarded as an interim period, which forms a boundary line like Barzakh (a barrier) between the two concepts.....Hence, it is certain that the reference, which date prior to 1901, in which he denied his prophethood, stand abrogated now and it is wrong to base any arguments on those references". (*Haqiqat-ul-Nubuwwat*, page 121).

(6) In the year 1904, among other claims, the Mirza also claimed himself to be Krishna. (Lecture by the Mirza delivered at Sialkot, November 2, 1904).

Let us trace through the above periods different statements of the Mirza and the policy adopted

by his community with regard to matters of dispute between the Ahmadis and the Muslims. These statements and viewpoints of policy are grouped below under different headings :

Khatm-i-Nubuwwat

(Finality of Prophethood)

1. Basic Concept

(7) Initially, the Mirza believed in the concept of the Finality of Prophethood exactly as the Muslims do, i.e., the line of prophethood came to an end in Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and that no prophet shall come after him. Explaining this, in several of his works, he writes :

1. "Are you not aware that the Munificent and High Lord bestowed upon our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) the name of 'Khātām-un-Nabiyyin' (the Last of the Prophets) without any exception, and our Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) explained it clearly by the saying. 'No prophet will come after me', for the benefit of the sceptics? If we permit the advent of a prophet after our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) as lawful, it is tantamount to regarding as lawful the opening of the door to the office of prophethood when once it has been closed by the Command of God. And this, as is clearly believed by every Muslim, is certainly wrong. How can a prophet

succeed our Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), when the chain of revelation came to an end with his death and God sealed the line of the Prophets in him (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)?" (*Hamamatul Bushara*, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 34).

2. The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) had repeatedly observed that no prophet would come after him. The tradition, 'No prophet will follow me', was so well-established that nobody ever doubted its authenticity. The Holy Qur'an, in which every word is absolute and final, also affirmed in the verse. "He is the Messenger of Allah and he is the Last of the Prophets", that prophethood has ended in our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)". (*Kitab al Barria*, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 184).

3. It is certain that no person can attain the office of prophethood after our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)" (*Izala-i-Oham*, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 577).

4. The Holy Qur'an does not permit as lawful the advent of any prophet, old or new, after the Last of the Prophets (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). (*Izala-i-Oham*, page 761).

5. Hence, what a bold audacity, recklessness and insolence it is to follow evil notions and wilfully ignore the stark reality presented by the Qur'an and to accept the idea of the coming of a new prophet after the Last of the Prophets (peace

and blessings of Allah be upon him) : (*Ayyam al-Sulh* Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 146).

6. I believe in all those precepts which form part of the Muslim creed and in which the Sunni sect believes. I accept all the tenets which are authenticated beyond doubt by the Qur'an and the Traditions. I regard any one who claims to be a prophet or a messenger after our Master and Last of the Prophets, Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), as an impostor and an infidel". (Proclamation issued by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, dated October 2, 1861, and reproduced in *Tabligh-i-Risalat*, vol. II, page 2).

7. Before this congregation of the Muslims present in this House of God (Jami' Masjid, Delhi) I declare without any reservation that I am a believer in the Finality of the Prophethood of the Last of the Prophets (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), and I regard any one who refutes the Finality of Muhammad's Prophethood as a pagan and outside the pale of Islam. (Written Statement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad which was read out in Jami' Masjid, Delhi, on October 23, 1891, reproduced in *Tabligh-i-Risalat*, vol. II, page 44).

2. Explanations of Earlier Claims

8 In order to set at rest the suspicions which some of his writings had aroused in the minds of Muslims that he claimed to be a prophet or he was about to lay claim to prophethood, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad offered the following explanations :

1. "We also condemn the claimant to prophethood with curses and we believe in the creed 'There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah'. We believe in the Finality of the Propethood of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). We do not profess to be the recipient of Prophetic Revelations. We only acknowledge to receive revelations on behalf of and under the protection of the Prophethood of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and the revelation which is transmitted to the friends of God who are faithful followers of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). I do not lay claim to the status of Prophethood. I only claim friendship with God and profess to be a Renovator". (Proclamation by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Reproduced in *Tabligh-i-Risalat*, vol. VI, page 302).

2. "This humble individual is neither a Prophet nor a Messenger, but only an inferior servant and follower of the innocent Prophet Muhammad Mustafa (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)".

(An observation of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Reproduced in *Qamar al-Mehdi*, by Qamar-ud-Din Jhelumi, page 58).

3. "It is true that in the Inspiration revealed to this person from God, this person has been frequently addressed as Prophet, Messenger and Envoy. But, these words have not been used in

their real sense. It is our conviction and belief that in the real sense of the word 'Prophet', no new or old Prophet will come after the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). But, it lies in the power of God to address an inspired person as a Prophet or a Messenger in the metaphorical sense". (*Siraj-i-Munir*, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, page 302).

4. "For twenty years, this humble person has constantly received inspirations from God in which often the word 'Prophet' or 'Messenger' has been used for him. But, the man who infers that this prophethood or ministry is real would be guilty of a grievous error These words which have been used with regard to my person in a metaphorical sense only create a schism in Islam and entail evil consequences. Hence, the community should avoid the use of these words in common parlance". (Letter addressed by the Mirza to *Akhbar al-Hukm*, Qadian, dated August 17, 1899. Reproduced in *Masih Mau'ud and Khatm-i-Nubuwwat* by Maulvi Muhammad Ali, M.A., page 4).

5. I am not a Prophet, but I am the bearer of a divine message from God (Innovator) and I am the One with whom God holds communion (Interlocutor)". (*A'ina Kamalat-i-Islam* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 383).

6. "I have certainly laid no claim to prophethood nor have I said that I am a Prophet. But,

these people showed haste and erred in comprehending my saying.....I have conveyed to people nothing except what I have written in my books and that is that I am an Innovator (a bearer of a message) and God holds communion with me in the same manner as He does with the Innovators".

Hamamatul Bushra by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 96).

7. "I am an Innovator, who among the Messengers is both the follower of a Prophet and an imperfect prophet himself".

(*Azala-i-Auham* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 569).

8. "In one sense, an Innovator (Muhaddith) is also a Prophet. Though not a perfect prophet he is, nevertheless, a prophet in part as he enjoys the privilege of holding direct communion with God. Things that are hidden from ordinary people are revealed to him, and just as the revelations transmitted to the Prophets are exempt from interference by the Devil, so are the inspirations revealed to him".

(*Tozih-i-Maram* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 18).

9. "This humble individual has never at any time claimed to be a Prophet or a Messenger in the real sense of the word. It is no heresy to use a word in its metaphoric sense or to use it in speech.

in its lexicographic connotation. But, I disapprove even of this lest it should cause misunderstanding among the general body of Muslims".

(*Anjam-i-Atham*, by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 27).

10. "So, this is only a question of samantics. In other words, what you call a 'dialogue' or an 'address', by the command of the Almighty, I call the same phenomenon, when it occurs frequently, as prophethood. Everybody has his own terminology to use".

(*Tamta Haqiqat-ul-Wahi* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 68).

11. "This humble individual wishes to bring to the notice of all Muslims that all the expressions used in my *Risala Fatch al-Islam*, *Tauzeek al-Maram* and *Azala-i-Auham*, such as 'In one sense an Innovator is a Prophet' or 'To be an Innovator is to be a Prophet in part' or '*Muhadithiat*' (Innovation) is a sort of imperfect Prophethood' are not used in their real sense. These have been used in their literal sense for the sake of simplicity. Otherwise, in no way, do I lay a claim to real Prophethood.....Therefore, I wish to make it clear to all Muslim brethren that if they are incensed over these words and if those words are shocking to their hearts, they should consider all the above expressions as amended and regard me only as an Innovator, because I would not in any cause schismatic strife among the Muslims. At every point, in place of the word 'Prophet', please substitute

the word 'Innovator' and consider the word 'Prophet' as deleted".

(Written statement read out at a Public Meeting, dated February 3, 1892. Reproduced in *Tabligh-i-Risalat*, vol. II, page 95).

3. Various Claims to Prophethood.

(9) Then, the Mirza laid claim to being a Prophet and this claim was not presented in a single form, but in many different forms on various occasions :

A. An 'Ummati' Prophet

1. "Later, the revelations from God descended on me like a torrent. This occurrence dislodged me from the present creed and the title of a Prophet was definitely conferred on me in such a way that on the one hand I was a Prophet and on the other a faithful follower of the Prophet,"

(*Hagiqatul Wahi*, by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 149).

B. A Prophet Without a Mandate

2. "All prophethoods save that which is authenticated by Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) are abolished. No Prophet bearing a mandate will come. And none can become a Prophet without carrying a mandate, save the one who is already a faithful follower of the Prophet (*Ummati*). Hence, on this basis, I am a faithful follower as well as a Prophet".

(*Tajalliyat-i-Ilahia* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 24).

C. A Prophet Bearing the Canonical Law

3. "Try to understand the real nature of 'Shari'at' (The Canonical Law). He, who is inspired by divine revelation, sets up a code of Injunctions and Prohibitions and gives a law to his followers, becomes a mandate-bearing Prophet.....My mandate contains both Injunctions and ProhibitionsAnd if you think that a mandate invariably contains original commandments, this is a fallacy. God affirms : i.e., 'The teachings of the Qur'an are also contained in the Torah'.

Arba'in No. 4 by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, pages 7-83).

D. A Shadow Prophet or Incarnation of Prophet

4. "Even as Real and Permanent Prophethoods are types of Prophethood, so the shadow or incarnate Prophethood represents another type. The Promised Messiah's status as a Shadow Prophet does not dispossess him of his status as a Prophet ; it represents merely a type of Prophethood..... The Shadow Prophet enjoys the same privileges as are bestowed upon real and permanent Prophets, for the substance of Prophethood is one and the same".
(*Kalimat-ul-Fasl, page 118*).

E. Incarnation of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)

5. "On the authority of the Qur'anic verseI am the incarnation of the

same Last Prophet. Twenty years ago, God addressed me in *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya* as Muhammad and Ahmad and created me an Incarnation of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)".

(*'Ek Ghalti Ka Izala—Clearing a Misunderstanding* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad).

F. A Composite Prophet Embracing All Prophets

6. "No Prophet came into this world whose name was not given to me. In *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*, God has affirmed me as Adam, Noah, Ibrahim, Ishaque, Ya'qub, Isma'il, Moses, Dawud, 'Isa, son of Mary, and Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). I am the Incarnation of all these Prophets".

(*Tatimmah Haqiqat-ul-Wahi* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 84).

G. Prophethood Ends in the Mirza

7. "In this *Ummat*, the distinction of being called a Prophet was bestowed upon me alone and all others are undeserving of this appellation".

(*Haqiqat-ul-Wahi* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 391).

8. "In no case can more than one Prophet be appointed from among the followers of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). Hence, the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) foretold the advent of one Prophet of God from among his followers and that Prophet is

the Promised Messiah. None save the Promised Messiah has been addressed as the Prophet of God or the Messenger of God, nor did the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) prophesy the coming of any one else. On the other hand, he refuted the others by saying, 'No Prophet will follow me', and explained it clearly that 'no Prophet and no messenger will come after me save the Promised Messiah'.

(*Tashkiz-ul-Azhan*, vol. 9, No. 3, pages 30-32).

Different Interpretations of the Finality of Prophethood.

(10) In order to provide grounds for their various claims, the Mirza and his community gave numerous interpretations to their idea of the Finality of Prophethood on different occasions, which are reproduced below :

First Interpretation

1. "If a follower, who receives divine messages and revelations and attains to the status of a Prophet on the basis of his faith in and obedience to the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), is honoured with the title of a Prophet, the seal of prophethood is not thereby violated, for this man is a follower. However, the advent of a Prophet who is not a follower is a violation of the Finality of Prophethood".

(*Chashma-i-Masihi* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 41).

2. "The Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) is the "Seal of the Prophets" in the sense that in the first place, all the accomplishments of prophethood have been concentrated in him and, secondly, no Messenger bearing a new mandate will come after him nor will follow any Prophet who is not a follower of the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)".

(*Chashma-i-Ma'arifat* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Appendix, page 9).

Second Interpretation

3. The Magnificent Lord appointed the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) as the Seal of the Prophets. In other words, the Lord bestowed upon him the Seal which was denied to the other Prophets in order to raise him to the highest order of excellence. It is for this reason that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) is called 'the Seal of the Prophets'. Adherence to him blesses one with the excellences of Prophethood and his spiritual guidance does not carve out a Prophet.

(*Huqiqat-ul-Wahi* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 96).

4. "In respect of 'the Seal of the Prophets', Hadrat Masih Mau'ud (the Promised Messiah) observed, 'The Seal of the Prophets' means that no Prophethood can be authenticated without his seal. When the seal is affixed, the paper becomes

authentic and is considered valid. Similarly, the Prophethood which is not authenticated and confirmed by the Seal of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) is not genuine".

(*Ma'fuzat-i-Ahmadiya* by Muhammad Manzur Elahi, part V, page 290).

Third Interpretation

5. "Through His Wisdom and Bounty God so willed that for thirteen centuries after the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), Prophethood became extinct among his followers, so that the dignity of his Prophethood may be established (in other words, his Prophethood may not be sullied by the advent of successor Prophets just after him). But, then in order to maintain the glory of Islam, certain persons were required who could be addressed as 'Prophets of God' after the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and further God willed to complete resemblance with the series of the Prophets of yore (from the series of Moses). So, God enjoined upon the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) towards the close of his life to utter the term 'Prophet of God' in reference to the Promised Messiah".

(Statement of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Published in *Akhbar-ul-Hukm*, Qadian, dated 7th April, 1903. Also produced in the pamphlet entitled '*Khatm-i-Nubuwwat* by Fakhr-ud-Din Multani, page 10).

Fourth Interpretation

6. "I am the shadow of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). Hence, the Seal of Prophethood does not stand violated. Muhammad's Prophethood is contained in Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him); in other words, none other than Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) is the Prophet. As I am the incarnation of the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and all the excellent traits of Muhammad, including his Prophethood, have been reflected in the image of my shadow; how could I be regarded as a separate person claiming prophethood distinct from the Prophethood of the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)".

(*Ek Ghalti Ka Azala* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad).

5. Revelation

(11) As in the case of 'Khatm-i-Nubuwwat' ('Finality of Prophethood'), the Mirza's position with regard to 'Revelation' and 'the visitations of the Archangel Gabriel' has been constantly shifting through various stages. A survey of Mirza's changing outlook is given below :

Initial Position

(1) To believe in the advent of a new Prophet after our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) is tantamount to believing in the doctrine that the door to the office of

prophethood will open after having been closed ; but this is certainly false, as is known to all Muslims. How can a Prophet come after our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), when the chain of Revelations was completed at his death ?”

(*Hamama-tul-Bushra* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 34).

(2) “Even if it be supposed for once that the transmission of divine revelation is open and that Gabriel will convey but a single sentence from God to man, it would clearly negate the idea of the Finality of Prophethood. If the Seal of Finality is broken and the transmission of divine messages opens, it makes no difference whether it is a single sentence or more thus transmitted.....After the demise of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), Gabriel has been forbidden to convey Prophetic Revelations for all time to come”.

(*Azala-i-Auham* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 577).

(3) “The Holy Qur’an does not admit the advent of any Prophet, old or new, after the Last of the Prophets. A Prophet receives his knowledge of Divine Law through the agency of Gabriel, but the office of Gabriel is now defunct so far as the transmission of divine revelations is concerned. And the advent of a Prophet in the absence of divine revelations is impossible”.

(*Azala-i-Auham*, page 761).

(4) "To be the recipient of Divine Law through revelations transmitted by Gabriel is a necessary attribute of the Messenger. And it is now established that the series of Prophetic revelations has been closed till Doomsday".

(*Azala-i-Auham*, page 614).

(5) "Hence how audacious, bold and insolent it is to pursue evil notions and wilfully neglect the clear injunctions of the Qur'an and to admit the advent of a new Prophet after the Last of the Prophets and to open the series of Prophetic revelations when God has closed it, for he who holds the dignity of a Prophet is also the recipient of Prophetic Revelation".

(*Ayyam-us-Sulh*, Ghulam Ahmad, page 146).

2. Second Position

(6) "We also condemn the claimant to Prophethood with causes and believe in the creed, 'There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah'. We believe in the Finality of Muhammad's Prophethood (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), and we are convinced that one who is a follower of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) may, under the shadow of the Prophethood of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), receive 'Revelation by inheritance' rather than 'Prophetic revelation'.

Proclamation published by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *vide Tabligh-i-Risalat*, vol. 6, page 302).

(7) "Is it necessary that one who claims to receive divine messages should also lay claim to Prophethood?"

(*Jang-i-Muqqadas* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 67).

(8) "I am not a Prophet, but God has appointed me an Innovator and an Interlocutor".

(*Aina Kamalat-i-Islam*, by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 383).

3. Third Position

(9) "What an absurd and erroneous fallacy it is to believe that the series of divine revelations has been closed for ever after the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and there is no possibility that the chain of revelations will be resumed till Doomsday. Shall we worship mere legends? Is such a religion worth the name in which direct communion with God is extinct?"

(Appendix to *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*, part V, Page 183. It must be pointed out that part V of *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*, came out in the year 1908).

(10) Persian Verses

آنچه من بشنوم ز وحی خدا	بخدا پاک دائمش ز خطا
همچو قرآن متره اش دامن	از خطاها همین ست ایمانم
بخدا هست ایس کلام مجید	از دهان خدائے پاک و وحید

(11) "Just as I believe in the verses of the Holy Qur'an, in the same measure, without an

iota of difference, I believe in the truth of the divine message which has been revealed to me in a constant chain of signs. I can swear in the House of God (*Baitullah*) that the sacred revelations received by me have been transmitted by the same God who conveyed His Divine Word to Hadrat Moses, Hadrat 'Isa (peace be upon them) and Hadrat Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)".

(*Ek Ghalti Ka Azala* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad).

(12) "I believe in the truth of the Divine Messages revealed to me in the same measure as I believe in the Torah, the Bible and the Holy Qur'an".

(*Arba'in No. 4* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 25).

(13) Persian Sentences

"آمد نزد من جبرئیل علیه السلام و مرا برگزید و گردش داد انگشت خود را و اشاره کرد خدا ترا ز دشمنان نگه خواهد داشت" -

Christ (peace be upon him and the Question of his Reappearance

(12) In respect of Jesus Christ (peace be upon him) and his reappearance and the Mirza's own claim to be the Promised Messiah, the viewpoint of the Mirza has been changing through different stages. An outline of his varying positions is given below :

1. First Position

(1) "This humble person's claim to be an incarnation of the Promised Messiah, which some dim-witted people have misunderstood as 'the Promised Messiah' is not a novelty which people have heard from me only at the present time..... I have certainly not claimed to be Christ, son of Mary (peace be upon him). The person who alleges that I have made such a claim is a disruptionist and a liar. On the other hand, over a period of seven or eight years it has been constantly published in my behalf that I am an Incarnation of Christ".

(*Azala-i-Auham*, by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 190).

(2) "It is possible, quite possible, that in some future age a Masih should appear who would appear true to all the apparent meanings of certain words contained in the Traditions".

(*Azala-i-Auham* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 199).

(3) "It has been revealed to this humble person that this insignificant creature by virtue of his poverty, humility, reliance upon God, self-denial and signs and lights represents an image of Christ's earlier existence on this earth. The nature of this humble person is akin to the nature of Christ (peace be upon him)".

(*Burakin-i-Ahmadiya* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 499).

(4) "It has been revealed to the author that he is the Renovator of the Age and his spiritual excellence matches the spiritual excellence of Christ, son of Mary (peace be upon him)".

(Proclamation by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *vide Tabligh-i-Risalat, volume I, page 15*).

(5) "If an objection is raised that an Incarnation of Christ must be a Prophet, for Christ (peace be upon him) was a Prophet of God, the answer, in the first place, is that our Master and Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) did not set Prophethood as a necessary attribute of the Promised Messiah. It is clearly recorded that the Promised Messiah would be a Muslim and would follow the Shari'at (the Canonic Law) like the other Muslims, and he will offer nothing more".

(*Tauzih al-Maram* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *page 19*).

2. Second Position

(6) "And this is 'Isa whose advent was awaited. In the revealed texts, the names Mary and Christ have been used in reference to me. It was said of me, 'We will make him the Image', and further it was said, 'This is Christ, son of Mary, whose advent was awaited'. That which the people doubt is Right and this is the one who awaited and doubt arises from lack of perception".

(*Kishti-i-Noah* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *page 48*).

(7) "In the third part of *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*, God addressed me as Mariam. Then, as is evident from *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*, I was reared in the image of Mariam for two years and continued to grow behind the veil.....Later, as was done in the case of Mary, I was filled with the soul of 'Isa and I was made pregnant in a metaphorical way. At last, after a period of many months (which is not of more than ten months' duration), I was delivered from Mary in the form of 'Isa by a divine message which is contained at the end of Part IV of *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*. It is thus that I was created the son of Mary and at the time when *Burahin-i-Ahmadiya*, was written, God did not reveal to me this hidden mystery".

(*Kishti-i-Noah*, page 46).

(8) "Hence be convinced that he who has descended is the son of Mary. He, like 'Isa, son of Mary, did not find a learned man, a spiritual father in his time who could become an agent for his spiritual birth. So, the Omnipotent Himself became his guardian and took him to His bosom and instructed him and named his servant 'the Son of Mary'.....Hence, in a metaphorical way, this is 'Isa, son of Mary, who was born without the agency of a father. Can you prove that he has any spiritual father? Can you furnish a proof that he is included in any of your four series? Hence, who else is he but the Son of Mary" ?

(*Azala-i-Ahuni* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 659).

(9) "We should know that the word 'Damascus', which appears in the Tradition of 'Muslim', or, in other words, as it is mentioned in the text of 'Sahih Muslim', which says that 'Hadrat Masih (peace be upon him) will descend near the white tower in the eastern part of Damascus', has always been a puzzle to the research scholars'.....Be it known that God has revealed to me the interpretation of the word 'Damascus' in this way : in this place, Damascus is the name of a town where live people who possess traits like those of Yazid and follow the perverse habits and thoughts of Yazid.....God has conveyed to me through Revelation that since a majority of its residents possess traits like those of Yazid, this town of Qadian has some connection with and bears similarity to Damascus".

(*Hashia Azala-i-Auham*, page 63-73).

(10) "I swear by God Who has appointed me, and only the accursed ones dispute over the actions of the Lord, that God has deputed me as the Promised Messiah".

(*Ek Ghalti Ka Azala*, *Tabligh-i-Risalat*, vol. 10, page 18).

-
- (1) It may be pointed out that no scholar before the time of the Mirza was ever perplexed over the word 'Damascus'. There is hardly any trace of amazement in the writing of all the exponents of the 'Science of Hadith'. However, surely the Mirza must have been sorely perplexed as to how he could establish himself as the Promised Messiah in the presence of this clear reference in the Traditions to a well known place.

Qadiani Community Constitutes an 'Ummat'

(13) The Mirza himself clearly affirmed the principle that a Prophet creates an 'Ummat'. He, then, proceeded on to call his community an 'Ummat'. A few extracts from his writings are given below to substantiate the point:

1. "The person who claims to be a Prophet will certainly affirm his Faith in the existence of God. Furthermore, such a man will proclaim that he is the recipient of Divine RevelationIn addition to this, he will relate to the people the Word of God which has been revealed to him. He will unite his followers into an 'Ummat' (body of the faithful) which believes in him as a Prophet and regards his book as the revealed Book of God".
(*Aina Kamalat-i-Islam* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 344).
2. "You should comprehend the real nature of 'Shari'at'. He who sets out a number of Injunctions and Prohibitions through Revelation received by him and establishes a canon for his 'Ummat' becomes an Apostle bearing the Canonic Law (*Shari'at*). My revelations include both Injunctions and Prohibitions".
(*Arba'in No. 4* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, pages 7-83).
3. "The former Masih was limited to being a Masih. Hence, his 'Ummat' was led astray and the chain of Moses came to an end. If I

were also confined to being a Masih, the end would not have been dissimilar. But, I have also been appointed a Mahdi and, in addition, I am an incarnation of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). Hence my 'Ummat' will be divided into two sects. Those who will succumb to the influence of Christianity shall be obliterated. The other sect will enter the fold of Mahdwiat".

(Statement by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, published in *Al-Fazl*, dated January 26, 1916).

Consequences of Refuting the Mirza from the Standpoint of Belief

The viewpoint of the Mirza with regard to the position of the deniers of his claim has also been varying from time to time. In this connection, an account of different policies adopted by the Mirza and his leading followers during various stages is given below :

Initial Position

1. "This humble person has been deputed by God to act as a Muhaddith (one who renews or reinterprets the law) among this 'Ummat' (community of the Faithful). A Muhaddith (Innovator) is a Prophet in one sense. Although his Prophethood is not perfect, yet he is a Prophet in part. It is obligatory on a Muhaddith (Innovator), as it is obligatory on all Prophets that he should proclaim his credentials loudly and the person who denies

the credentials of the Muhaddith (Innovator) is to some extent liable to punishment”.

(*Tauzih-i-Maram*, by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 18).

2. “From the start, it has been my creed that no person can become an infidel or a *Dajjal* (Antichrist) on the grounds of refuting me. Nonetheless, he will be the one led astray and deviated from the right path, and I do not call him faithless, devoid of religious faith”.

(Marginal Note) “It should be borne in mind that only such Prophets as bring *Shari'ah* (the Canonic Law) and fresh mandate from God are vested with the privilege of denouncing their refuters as infidels. With the exception of the bearer of a divine mandate, the denier of all the Innovators and the Inspired Ones, however, exalted a position they may be holding in the favour of God and in spite of enjoying the privilege of holding communion with the Almighty, does not become a heretic”.

(*Taryaq-ul-Qulub* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 130).

3. “Every Muslim to whom my message has been propagated, and who does not hold me as the final arbiter in all matters, nor does he accept me as the Promised Messiah, nor does he believe in the divine origin of my revealed mandate, is liable to be held accountable in heaven irrespective of his being a Muslim”.

(*Tuhfat-un-Nadwah* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 4).

4. "The person who refutes the Promised Messiah or is indifferent to the necessity of believing in him is absolutely ignorant of the true spirit of Islam and the nature of Prophethood and the purpose of Divine Ministry. Such a person does not deserve to be called a true Muslim and a true obedient servant of God and His Apostle..... 'Transgressor' is the term for those who do not believe in the Promised Messiah and drift away from his creed".

(*Hujjatullah*—Address delivered in Lahore by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Reproduced here from *An-Nubuwata Fi Islam* by Maulvi Muhammad Ali, M.A., page 214).

Final Position

5. "The person who does not follow thee and does not pledge allegiance to thee and remains thy adversary is a denizen of Hell, for he disobeys God and His Apostle".

(Proclamation *Ma'yar al-Khyar* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, dated May, 25, 1900. Reproduced here from *Kalimat-ul-Fasl*, by Sahibzada Bashir Ahmad, page 129).

6. "Now when there is no doubt in the matter that salvation cannot be attained without affirming in the Promised Messiah, why are needless efforts made to establish that the non-Ahmadis are

Muslims ?”

(*Kalimat-ul-Fasl*, page 129).

7. “Whenever Hadrat Mirza has addressed the non-Ahmadis as Muslims, he has done so because they profess to be Muslims. Otherwise, the Mirza, by an express command of God, did not look upon his deniers as Muslims”.

(*Kalimat-ul-Fasl*, page 126).

8. (After making a reference to a writing of the Mirza, the text proceeds as follows):

“This writing of Hadrat Masih Mau'ud (the Promised Messiah) provides answers to several questions. In the first place, God conveyed to the Hadrat through inspiration that his denier was not a Muslim, and not only did God reveal this information, but also commanded the Hadrat to look upon his deniers as outside the pale of Islam. Secondly, the Hadrat expelled 'Abdul Hakim Khan from the community on the ground that he addressed the non-Ahmadis as Muslims. Thirdly, to hold the view that the deniers of the Promised Messiah are Muslims is adhering to an absurd belief. Fourthly, God's blessing is withheld from the person who adheres to the above belief”.

(*Kalimat-ul-Fasl*, page 125).

9. “Heresy is of two types. Firstly, a person who refutes Islam and disbelieves in the Divine Ministry of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) is a heretic, an infidel. Secondly, for example, a person denies the

Promised Messiah and in spite of the provision of proofs denounces him as an imposter.....when considered closely, both types form the single kind of Heresy".

(*Hadikat-ul-Wahi* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, page 179).

10. "All those Muslims who have not pledged allegiance to Hadrat Masih Mau'ud, including even those who may not have heard his name, are infidels and outside the pale of Islam".

(*Aina-i-Sadakat* by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood Ahmad, page 35).

11. "Every man who believes in Moses (peace be upon him), but refutes Christ (peace be upon him) or acknowledges Christ (peace be upon him), yet disbelieves in Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) or believes in Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), but refutes the Promised Messiah, is not only a heretic, but a confirmed infidel and is outside the pale of Islam". (*Kalimat-ul-Fasl*, page 110).

12. "God sent Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) again in Qadian in order to fulfil His Promise". (*Kalimat-ul-Fasl*, page 110).

13. "So, the Promised Messiah himself is the Prophet of God who has appeared in the world a second time to carry out the Propagation of Islam".

(*Kalimat-ul-Fasl*, page 155).

14. "Now, the matter is quite clear. If the denial of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) entails heresy or infidelity, a denial of the Promised Messiah must also amount to heresy, for the Promised Messiah is not other than the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) himself ; they are one and the same". *Kalimat-ul-Fasl*, page 147).

15. "The person who takes up a neutral position with regard to us is in reality our refuter, and he who does not affirm faith in us and yet speaks well of us is also our adversary".

(Statement by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, published in the newspaper *Badr*, dated April 24, 1903. Reproduced from *Munkarin-i-Khilafat Ka Anjam* page 82).

Consequences of Refuting the Mirza from a practical point of view.

16. "Subsequently, Hadrat Masih Mau'ud clearly enjoined upon us : We should avoid all contacts with the non-Ahmadiis in matters of bereavement and marriage. How can we say their funeral prayers, when we do not share their grief ?"

(*Al-Fasl*, June 18, 1916).

17. "The venerable Mirza observes : It is not forbidden to take the daughter of a non-Ahmadi in marriage, for it is lawful to marry women from the people of the Book". *Al Fasl*, December 16, 1920).

18. "It is notified for public information that to marry Ahmadi girls to non-Ahmadi men is unlawful. Particular care should be taken in this regard in future".

(Notification by the Secretary, Public Affairs, Qadian, published in *Al-Fazl*, February 14, 1933).

19. "Hadrat Mirza abstained from saying funeral prayers for his son (the late Mirza Fazal Ahmad) on the ground that he was a non-Ahmadi".

(*Al-Fazl*, December 15, 1921).

20. "So, bear in mind, as God has revealed to me, it is unlawful, definitely unlawful, for you to say prayers behind a person who charges us with apostasy, or one who refutes us or one who wavers. Your leader in prayer should be one of your own community".

(*Arba'in No. 3* by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad).

21. "My belief is that it is unlawful to say funeral prayers for those who pray behind the non-Ahmadis, for in my view such people are outside the pale of Ahmadiyat. Similarly, it is unlawful to say funeral prayers for those who give their daughters in marriage to the non-Ahmadis and die without offering repentance for this sin".

(Letter of Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmood Ahmad, published in *Al-Fazl*, April 13, 1926).

22. "Hadrat Mau'ud has permitted only such dealings with the non-Ahmadis as were held lawful with regard to the Christians by the Holy

Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). Our prayers were segregated from the prayers of the non-Ahmadis. It was forbidden to marry our daughters to them. We were enjoined upon not to say their funeral prayers. What else is there that we can share with them? There are two types of relationship—Religious and Worldly. The principal link in religious relationship is joint worship and the chief means of worldly relationship is matrimony. But, both of these relationships are forbidden to us. If you ask, 'are we at liberty to take the daughters of the non-Ahmadis?' my answer is, 'the daughters of the Christians are also permitted to us'. And if you enquire, 'why do we extend salam to the non-Ahmadis?', the answer is, 'it is established from the Tradition that on certain occasions the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) returned even the greetings of the Jews'.

Kalimat-ul-Faql, page 159).

